

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Clinton, Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Dewey Lodge, No. 283, International Association of Machinists, of Clinton, Iowa, for back longevity and back overtime pay of members of organized labor on Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Clinton Commercial Club, that the authority of the Postmaster General to make changes in the administration of the parcel-post law should be limited, and that changes in said law should only be made by congressional action; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the August Wentz Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, with reference to changes in the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. S. Wells, Herman Wesenberg, Henry Ketelsen, Nick Diecksel, and 221 other citizens of Iowa, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Friendship Grange, of Kenton, Hardin County, Ohio, in favor of House bill 11897, relative to farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the Bank of Horton, Horton, Kans., suggesting an amendment to the income-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in favor of House bill 12873, relative to the taxation of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the legislative committee of the National Grange, favoring passage of bill for system of farm credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to assessment of real estate in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York City, protesting against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring passage of the widows and orphans pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Otto J. Ekwald and other citizens, of Worcester, Mass., for an investigation of the aim and purpose of the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 6, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come to Thee that we may put our feet upon the eternal granite of Thy righteousness. There is but one law in all the ages and one Supreme Ruler in all the universe. If there seems to be a break in the continuance of Thy rule, it is because of our own distorted power of human reasoning or because our sense perceptions are held in bondage unto sin. Ever from Thy throne there goeth forth the one law of human conduct, ever continuing, ever consistent, full of love—the revelation of the divine mind to men. We pray that this day we may square our lives by the divine order and live to glorify Thy name, to extend the interests of the kingdom of truth and righteousness in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11338) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 3206. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Baker, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon;

S. 3454. An act authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to lease to the city of Port Angeles, Wash., certain property;

S. J. Res. 90. A joint resolution to continue in effect the provisions of the act of March 9, 1906 (Stat. L., vol. 34, p. 56);

H. R. 11331. An act to repeal an act regulating the construction of bridges across the Muskingum River in Ohio; and

H. R. 13365. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Tombigbee River near Old Cotton Gin Port, in Monroe County, Miss.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of sundry citizens of St. Paul, Minneapolis, Moorhead, Pelican Rapids, Farwell, and St. Cloud, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Scandinavian Christian Church, of Compton, Minn., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Hennepin County Lodge, No. 175, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit immigrants seeking refuge from religious or political persecution to enter this country without any educational test, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KERN presented a petition of the Central Bureau of the Central Verein, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries or occupational diseases in the course of their employment, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Fort Worth, Tex., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Union Sunday School, of Cochran, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of Lynchburg, Va., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LANE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Baker, Oreg., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Decatur County, Ind., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Ida McKinley Council, No. 5, Daughters of America, of Lynn, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Boston and Springfield and of Local Union No. 90, Bartenders' Union, of Lawrence, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Captain John M. Pettingell Camp, No. 52, United Spanish War Veterans, of Amesbury, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to widows and minor children of soldiers of the Spanish-

American War, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New Bedford, Dartmouth, Acushnet, and Mattapoisett, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling employees in the Postal Service to work on Sundays, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the John Hancock Branch, American Continental League of America, of Lynn, Mass., remonstrating against an appropriation for the celebration of the so-called "One hundred years of peace among English-speaking peoples," which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection and grading of grain entering into interstate commerce, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Harlan and of sundry citizens of Fulton County and Culver, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 412, of Kokomo, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide an educational test for immigrants to this country, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Fifth Division, Railway Mail Association, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the demotion of certain railway postal clerks by reason of reduction in force and car space, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Honey Creek Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vigo County, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BRADLEY presented memorials of sundry citizens of Jefferson County and Kenton County; of the German-American Alliance of Louisville; of sundry citizens of Covington, Lexington, Louisville, Frankfort, Shively, Chapeze, Newport, Paducah, Owensboro, and Early Times, all in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of French, Charity, Stephens, and Dobins, all in the State of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Sunshine Council, No. 97, Daughters of America, of Bromley, and of Banner Council, No. 7, Daughters of America, of Louisville, both in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Connecticut State Branch, Post Office Clerks' Association, of Bridgeport, Conn., and a petition of the Civil Service Employees' Association, of South Norwalk, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Granite State Dairymen's Association, of Durham, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the coloring of oleomargarine in imitation of butter, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to standardize the sale prices of drugs, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Olympia, Wash., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of Willapa Harbor, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 450, Cooks and Kitchen Helpers' Union, of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating beverages, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Clarkston, Prescott, College Place, and Farmington, all in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### FISHERIES REGULATIONS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate passed a bill adopting some regulations in conformity to a treaty made between this country and Great Britain in reference to international boundary matters. When that legislation was up I did not object to its consideration, because I had been assured by parties who claimed to represent some of the fishing interests of our country that, while they had some objections, they would not oppose the passage of the bill.

I received a telegram this morning asking that the legislation be delayed and setting out the objections these people have to the regulations. I simply ask to have the telegram, in the nature of a petition, printed in the RECORD so that the RECORD will show the objections they make to the regulations.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Telegram.]

SEATTLE, WASH., March 5, 1914.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Puget Sound fishing interests will be vitally and injuriously affected by passage of any bill containing regulations for Puget Sound as set out in Root Senate bill 4437 or Flood House bill 13005. Respectfully request all congressional action be deferred until after new satisfactory regulations for Puget Sound can be agreed upon by international commission. This should be accomplished within reasonably short time after a hearing. If American commissioner will cooperate, we would not oppose bill with proper regulations, but must seriously object to regulations contained in pending bills. Regulation 62 prohibits fishing for all salmon from August 25 to September 15 each year. This will destroy entirely humpback-salmon industry on Sound. Regulation 63 provides for a 48-hour weekly close season. State law provides 36 hours, which is ample. The provisions in regulation 64 prohibiting use of jigger on fish traps will diminish efficiency of trap by approximately a third to a half and will put many traps out of existence altogether. This will benefit no one except British Columbia fishermen. There are also other serious objections. If proposed regulations are adopted by Congress they can not be changed for four years, and then after one year's notice by either Government except by agreement of the two commissioners ratified by Congress and Canadian Parliament, which is highly improbable. See article 6. Treaty regulations should be made right before Congress acts. We believe that Prof. Prince and Dr. Smith could be gotten together and easily adjust the matter, so as not to cripple a great industry. A printed protest by salmon fishermen of Puget Sound was furnished to all Members of the Sixty-first Congress. Please examine such protest. Full letter follows.

E. A. SIMS,  
T. J. GORMAN,  
KERR & McCORD,  
DORR & HADLEY.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I have not attempted to encumber the RECORD with the large number of letters, petitions, and telegrams respecting Senate joint resolution No. 1 that I have received, but I have this morning received a telegram here from an excellent lady, which telegram I ask may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Telegram.]

NEW YORK, March 5, 1914.

Senator H. F. ASHURST,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If you allow suffrage amendment to go to vote now, I shall consider you false to our interests and shall not hesitate to make that fact known in important places. Those who have asked you to push the amendment to vote now are not genuinely interested in its immediate success. They are progressives, and are using you. Beware of their advice. We expect you to represent us, not them.

MRS. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. Is the sender of the telegram a member of the general board on woman suffrage?

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know. She is a very excellent lady, who has taken great interest in woman suffrage. I have just received this telegram, in which she expresses some objections to a vote at this time, and says if the resolution goes to a vote she will feel it to be her duty to say to the country that I have not been diligent or pursued a wise course. I have so much



respect for her I feel that her views ought to be incorporated into the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that as I understand it she is not on the general board of woman suffrage located at New York, which wants a vote on Senate joint resolution No. 1, introduced by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Of course, as to that I do not know. The joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and reported by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST].

Mr. JAMES. If the Senator from Utah will permit me, my information is that Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont is one of the recognized leaders, if not the leader, of the movement for woman suffrage.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am not aware as to that, and that is the reason why I asked the Senator from Arizona if he knew whether she is a member of the board or not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

#### INSPECTION AND GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a telegram here in the shape of a petition, and as it pertains to matters which have been discussed in the Senate I will ask to have it read. It is short.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

[Telegram.]

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., March 5, 1914.

Hon. P. J. McCUMBER,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was passed to-day by the Farmers Grain Dealers' Association of North Dakota in convention assembled:

"Resolved, Realizing that at this time a spirit of unrest exists among the citizens of this State in regard to the marketing of farm products, and recognizing that the sentiment exists among producers that there are injustices and irregularities practiced by the grain exchanges of the country detrimental to the producer, therefore we respectfully ask the Congress of the United States to make a thorough and impartial investigation of the grain exchanges of this country, and in particular the Duluth Board of Trade, the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, and the Equitable Cooperative Exchange of Minneapolis, Minn., to the end that the truth will be known and remedial legislation be enacted if necessary."

S. W. UNKENHOLZ,  
Mandan, N. Dak.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VARDAMAN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9318) to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, entitled "An act to establish postal savings depositories for depositing savings at interest with the security of the Government for repayment thereof, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 316) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 278, authorizing and directing the Sergeant at Arms to appoint James F. Sellers additional messenger at \$1,200 per annum, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution 282, authorizing the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine to hold hearings, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred Senate resolution 285, authorizing the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to employ temporarily a clerk, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10523) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 318) thereon. I desire to give notice that I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill to-morrow after the morning business is concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT SARTELL, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 13545) to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town of Sartell, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 315) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CHILTON. I report back from the Committee on Printing Senate resolution 280, with amendments. The committee reports it favorably. I would call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who submitted the resolution, to it, but he is not in the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator that in making these reports from the Committee on Printing it would be well to ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

Mr. CHILTON. I was thinking of doing that. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments of the Committee on Printing were, in line 15, to strike out the word "and" before "report," and at the end of the resolution to insert "and the views of the minority of the joint select committee to frame a government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 572, 44th Cong., 2d sess.)," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That there be reprinted in one volume, for the use of the Senate document room, 500 copies of Senate report entitled "Memorials of Authorities of City of Washington," etc., by Mr. Southard (23d Cong., 2d sess., Feb. 2, 1835); report of the joint select committee of Congress appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Government of the District of Columbia (S. Rept. No. 453, 43d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 1 to 29, inclusive); report from the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on "Legal relations of the District of Columbia and the United States" (H. Rept. No. 627, 43d Cong., 1st sess.); report of a joint select committee appointed to prepare a suitable frame of government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 479, 43d Cong., 2d sess.); and the views of the minority of the joint select committee to frame a government for the District of Columbia, etc. (S. Rept. No. 572, 44th Cong., 2d sess.).

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### CREEK EQUALIZATION FUND (S. DOC. NO. 439).

Mr. CHILTON. I report favorably from the Committee on Printing the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], submitted on the 3d instant, to print the memorial of R. C. Allen on the Creek equalization fund, and I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be stated.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. OWEN said: Mr. President, I have a memorial from R. C. Allen, national attorney of the Creek Nation of Indians with regard to the Creek equalization fund, giving the data and reasons why it should be disposed of by the Senate. I think the memorial ought to be printed as a Senate document for the information of the Senate. I do not know whether or no the Senate has adopted a rule requiring such matters to be referred to the Committee on Printing. If so, I should like to ask a reference of the memorial to the Committee on Printing and to request a prompt report on it, because the Indian appropriation bill is now before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CHILTON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order as read.

The order was agreed to.

#### NATIONAL AID TO GOOD ROADS (S. DOC. NO. 438).

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably an article by Jonathan Bourne, jr., on the subject of national aid to good roads, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] on the 20th ultimo. I am directed by the committee to request that the article be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. DOC. NO. 437).

Mr. CHILTON. From the Committee on Printing I submit a report (No. 317), accompanied by an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year 1913, together with the accompanying appendices, illustrations, and report of the semicentennial anniversary of said academy, be printed as a Senate document.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS:

A bill (S. 4701) for the relief of Edwin Price; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 4702) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the

Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Wyoming:

A bill (S. 4703) for the relief of the heirs of Granville S. Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 4704) to amend an act entitled "An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all surplus lands after allotment," approved May 30, 1908 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4705) granting a pension to Eli Ziegler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 4706) granting a pension to Caroline E. Stevens Van Wormer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 4707) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4708) to authorize and provide for the investigation and survey of swamp, wet, and overflowed lands in the Mississippi Valley susceptible of drainage, and to devise plans and systems therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 4709) to repeal the several acts authorizing an internal tax on cotton and relating to the same and providing for the payment to the treasurers of the respective States wherein said tax was levied and collected the amounts so collected for the use and benefit of the common-school fund of said respective States and for purposes of general education; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4710) appropriating money for improvement, extension, and repair of the Army and Navy Hospital, at Hot Springs, Ark.;

A bill (S. 4711) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct a new bathhouse on the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., for the accommodation of indigents;

A bill (S. 4712) to authorize the sale of certain lots in the Hot Springs Reservation for church and hospital purposes; and

A bill (S. 4713) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be made certain improvements on the Government reservation at Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President be, and he is, requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to advise the Senate what nations have protested against the passage of coastwise vessels through the Panama Canal free of tolls, what representations have been made regarding the same, and copies of all communications received from foreign countries relating thereto together with copies of answers submitted by the United States.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

#### TOLL-EXEMPTION PROVISION OF PANAMA CANAL ACT.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The resolution (S. Res. 289) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President be respectfully requested to inform the Senate, in so far as not incompatible with the public interest, what "other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence" are referred to in the President's message of March 5, 1914; and to so inform the Senate what connection such matters have with the proposed repeal of the toll-exemption provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me that the resolution had better go over for a day. I object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with the resolution.

A few days ago I noticed printed in the Washington Post, of this city, a purported interview with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], to which I desire to call attention, in connection with the President's message of yesterday, and particularly that portion of it which is quoted in the resolution I have just introduced.

In this purported interview the Senator from Louisiana stated that he had just had an interview with the President; that he had previously been very strongly in favor of the exemption of American coastwise vessels from the payment of

tolls for passing through the Panama Canal, but that on account of the statement which the President had just made to him he had changed his mind. I desire to read this language from the statement of the Senator from Louisiana as it is reported:

But I recognize now, as I always did, the substantial difference between our right of exemption and our enforcement of that right.

Understanding through newspaper reports only that the President believed our national interests would be subserved by the repeal of the exemption clause in the present law, I have appealed to him directly for an expression of his views. He has answered that the repeal of the exemption clause is necessary for the continuance of our present friendly relations with foreign powers and the success of our foreign policies.

#### FEELS IT HIS DUTY TO ASSIST.

Considering the canal tolls exemption law previously enacted to be a question of policy and not of principle, and recognizing the great responsibility resting on the President for the successful conduct of our foreign relations, and also the delicacy of the present trying situation in regard to those relations, I feel it my public duty to assist the President in carrying out his wishes in this matter.

Mr. President, it occurs to me, if the situation referred to in matters not named is so delicate, and the success of whatever foreign policy the United States at the present time may have depends upon the repeal of the Panama tolls exemption clause—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. Just one moment, that the Senate ought to be informed what that matter is and in what this delicacy consists which impels Senators to promptly change their expressed attitude upon this great question.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Washington that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is not present to-day; he has been ill for several days. Does not the Senator from Washington think it would be better to delay his remarks until the Senator from Louisiana is present and can respond?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have nothing further to say with reference to the Senator from Louisiana, and I have said nothing with reference to the Senator which in any way involves him further than to give him an opportunity, if he sees fit to do so, to make a statement, which he can do at any time.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Washington has introduced an interview, and he does not know whether it is accurate. I repeat, the Senator from Louisiana is not present, and it would seem to me the better course would be to wait until that Senator is present, as the Senator from Washington desires to comment upon a quoted interview with the Senator from Louisiana. Mr. President, I call for the regular order this morning.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think I have the floor, Mr. President. I desire to occupy it only very briefly.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if I mistake not, the regular order—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Virginia insists upon the regular order, morning business must be proceeded with.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well, Mr. President.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution limiting the editions of the publications of the Bureau of Education was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurrent or other resolutions are still in order. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) yesterday submitted by Mr. CUMMINS was read, as follows:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 773, being a bill to establish a primary election for the nomination by political parties of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes.*

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] who submitted the resolution is not present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that, by unanimous consent, the resolution is to lie over from day to day, without prejudice, at least until after the Committee on Privileges and Elections had met upon Saturday next. The Chair thinks he is correct in that understanding. If so, the resolution will again go over without prejudice.



## LIGHTHOUSE TENDER FOR GENERAL SERVICE.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2876. It is a very short bill. I have a letter from the Secretary of Commerce urging speedy action upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 2876) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota one question. I ask was the original transmission from the department based as to cost upon the estimate of the department?

Mr. NELSON. It was based on an estimate made some years ago, but it is found that a suitable tender can not be constructed for the amount originally estimated.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. How many years ago was the estimate made, I will ask the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NELSON. I can not recall at this moment.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Does not the bill state it?

Mr. NELSON. The estimate was made before the appropriation was made, and the department has urgently recommended this increase. It is insisted that a suitable tender can not be built for the amount of the original estimate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 1, page 1, line 6, after the words "Secretary of Commerce," to strike out "and Labor," so as to make the section read:

That the authorization in the act approved March 4, 1913, to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to construct a lighthouse tender for general service at a cost not exceeding \$250,000, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost provided in said authorization from \$250,000 to \$325,000; and the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized to have constructed a lighthouse tender for general service as provided in said item in said bill to cost not exceeding \$325,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. WORKS obtained the floor.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KERN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gronna	Oliver	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Hughes	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Brady	James	Owen	Smoot
Brandeggee	Jones	Perkins	Stephenson
Bristow	Kenyon	Pittman	Sutherland
Bryan	Kern	Poindexter	Swanson
Burton	Lane	Robinson	Thomas
Cañon	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lewis	Saulsbury	Tillman
Chilton	Lodge	Shafroth	Townsend
Clapp	McCumber	Sheppard	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Walsh
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Warren
Dillingham	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Fall	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Works
Gallinger	Norris	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

## PROHIBITION OF SMOKING IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. WORKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, yesterday evening I gave notice that I would this morning call up the antismoking resolution. I was out of the Chamber when the morning business

was closed, and as the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has the floor and desires to go on, I give notice that I will call up the resolution to-morrow morning immediately after the conclusion of the routine morning business.

## "ONE YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC RULE."

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, we have now had a year of Democratic rule and Democratic legislation. It is an appropriate time to take account of what has been accomplished. The judicial department has remained practically as it was, unaffected by the change of administration. Therefore we must look to the executive and legislative departments of the Government for any achievements for good or evil as they affect the common weal. There has been much boasting of the accomplishments of Democratic management of public affairs. I should like the attention of the Senate while I review in a friendly way the sum of these achievements. I say in a friendly way because what I shall say will not be said in any spirit of animosity, however much I may differ from some of those who sincerely believe, as I do not, that the legislation enacted by this Congress and the conduct of the executive department thus far under Democratic rule have been in the public interest and for the common good.

My review of the events of the year just closed will be in a spirit of personal good will, and I shall hope to make it as fair and just as one can who speaks from the standpoint of a political antagonist and disbeliever, in a great degree, in the principles and policies of the Democratic Party. From that standpoint I shall deal with the question frankly and without reservation.

When the Democratic national convention met in Baltimore it declared for certain principles and announced certain political policies, and upon these declared principles and policies nominated and elected Woodrow Wilson President of the United States and secured control of both branches of Congress, thus placing the party in full control of the Government in all its departments. But the platform of the party was not approved by a majority of the voters of the country, and its candidate for President was elected by a minority of the electors, resulting from a division in the Republican Party. Therefore any change in the policies or principles of government can not be attributed to the people of the country or founded upon public approval. They are the acts of the Democratic Party only, founded on the Democratic platform, rejected by a majority of the voters of the country, and brought about in important particulars mainly by the coercive power of the President, avowedly acting as the head of the party in furtherance of the principles and pledges contained in its political platform. So the Democratic Party should justly be credited with anything good that has been accomplished during the year and held responsible for any wrongs or errors that have been committed.

Now, Mr. President, what has been accomplished by this administration, and how much of good and how much of evil has or is likely to come from it?

For the year the Congress has been almost continuously in session, at enormous expense to the Government. Nothing like it has ever been known. And what has all this been for? Mostly for the political advantage of the Democratic Party. It was conceived that there was a great public demand for a revision of the tariff, and to enact a new tariff law would at once bring the party into public favor. So a special session of Congress was called to enact such a law. Everything else must give way to this purpose. Other important legislation, more important in the public interest than the tariff, was crowded out and neglected. The committees of both Houses, with their calendars full of bills, many of them of great importance, were compelled to remain idle for months because of the desire of the Democrats to force through the tariff bill. Nothing was allowed to stand in its way. It was supposed that when this bill was passed Congress would be allowed to adjourn. But the tariff bill was not well received; it was feared that its passage was going to injure instead of help the Democratic Party at the coming election. Our Democratic friends were in a panic; their efforts had miscarried; something must be done to restore confidence and the party to public favor. It was believed that there was a universal public demand for a new banking and currency law and that to enact such a law would avoid a panic and thus save the Democratic Party from certain disaster. Congress was ready and anxious to adjourn; but this could not be allowed with this cloud of public disfavor resting on the party. The President again came to the rescue. He demanded in no uncertain terms that Congress remain in session and pass a banking and currency bill. Again all other legislation, however important, was subordinated to this supreme effort to restore the Democratic Party to favor. The session was prolonged through the entire summer and fall for the sole purpose of passing this

one bill. It met with unexpected opposition. Prolonged hearings were had upon it. As it was proposed it was not pleasing to Wall Street and the bankers throughout the country. Some way must be found to satisfy the money power. This was not easy to do and still satisfy the people generally. As a result, the entire balance of the special session, from September 9, when the tariff bill was passed, until the beginning of the regular session, the 1st of December, was wasted in waiting for action on the currency bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Never before had there been such waste of time and public moneys.

Mr. President, I am going to comment on these two bills and their effect before I have finished, but before doing so I want to point out in a general way what else has been done by Congress in the way of enacting laws.

During the year Congress enacted 63 bills. Of these, 18 were bridge bills simply granting the right to various corporations to construct bridges across navigable streams, none of which were contested and passed as a matter of course; five were appropriation bills that must be passed each year; two related to the Panama Exposition to be held at San Francisco; one to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy; one providing for mediation, conciliation, and arbitration in controversies between employers and employees; three to limit the cost of certain public buildings; one to provide for representation of the United States in the Fourteenth International Congress on Alcoholism; one authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to Spain; one providing for the acquiring of station grounds by the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington; one extending to the port of Dallas, Tex., certain privileges in the matter of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise; one to provide a method for opening lands restored from reservation or withdrawal; one to fix the times and places of holding district court in Arizona; two to amend the Judicial Code; one to create an additional land district in the State of Nevada; one extending the privileges of transportation of dutiable merchandise to the port of Perth Amboy, N. J.; one granting permission to the city of Marshfield, Oreg., to close Mill Slough in that city; one to enable the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to employ additional clerks; one authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant further extensions of time within which to comply with the law and make proof on desert-land entries in certain counties in the State of Washington; one to amend the statute relating to mining claims; one authorizing the appointment of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to Paraguay and Uruguay; one fixing the term of the major general commandant of the Marine Corps at four years; one granting the city and county of San Francisco certain rights of way over public lands; one to provide for expenses of representatives of the United States at the International Maritime Conference for Safety of Life at Sea; two amending the law relating to the importation and use of opium; one amending the law relating to the liability of postmasters; one granting the Emigration Canon Railroad Co. the right of way over public lands; one to regulate the payment of postal money orders; one to enjoin and abate houses of lewdness, and so forth, commonly known as the "red-light" act; one authorizing the changing of the names of certain steamships; one providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; one to promote the efficiency of the Naval Militia; one appropriating funds for the eradication of hog cholera and dourine; one regulating the hours of employment of women in the District of Columbia; one authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell a tract of land to the city of Lawton, Okla., for watershed and water-supply purposes. Then follow the only bills of real public importance passed during the year other than the appropriation bills, namely, the tariff act and the act establishing Federal reserve banks.

#### THE TARIFF BILL.

For the tariff bill as it passed and became a law the President is responsible. But for the coercion used by him to compel action by Congress it never would have passed. It is not approved by the judgment or conscience of a majority of the Members of Congress in either House. It probably would not have received a majority of the votes of the Democratic Members of the Senate. His demand was for free wool and free sugar. The Members of his party submitted unwillingly to this demand.

There were many other provisions of the bill that were objectionable to Democratic Members of both Houses. In this emergency the demands of the President were supplemented by the secret caucus that stifled the consciences and closed the lips of Democratic Members of Congress who opposed the bill from conviction. As it finally passed it was inimical to the best interests of my State and almost all of its industries. Other

States suffered in the same way. The reduction of duties so reduced the revenues of the Government that direct taxation became necessary to make up the loss. So the people are having a taste of direct taxation in the form of an income-tax law, made necessary by the Democratic policy of free trade or a tariff for revenue only. It was openly avowed on the floor of the Senate that no account was taken of the protection of American industries in framing the bill, and that it was framed purely as a revenue measure. Some Democratic Senators declared in positive terms against any legislation designed to protect our home industries by tariff duties. The Democratic Party committed itself, by the passage of this bill, as opposed to all such legislation. Its most injurious and destructive provisions were directed at the farming industries of the country, but the manufacturing and other industries have not escaped the effects of this blighting legislation. Not only so, but the laboring man, who is dependent upon the success and prosperity of the home industries of his country, has not escaped. By taking off the tariff—in many instances placing our products on the free list—the Democratic Party has taken away from our own people their home markets and opened them up to the products of the cheap labor of foreign countries for a reduced duty, or none at all, thus jeopardizing our home industries, cheapening and degrading labor, turning thousands of workmen out of employment, and, at the same time, depriving the Government of needed revenue that must be made up by direct taxation.

Mr. President, what was all this for? Ostensibly for the benefit of the ultimate consumer by cheapening our own products. But has it done so? Quite the contrary. While the importers and foreign producers pay less money to gain entrance for their goods into our markets they have pocketed the difference, and where there has been any reduction in price to our own producers it has not reduced the price of the same goods to the consumer. If the imported goods can be sold for less than will produce a profit to our own producers it only means the surrender of our markets to importers from other countries, leaving them to impose their own prices when they have crowded out our own people. Now, sir, that is just what is being done. Reports from the Departments of Commerce and of Labor show two things beyond dispute, namely, that the tariff bill has brought about largely increased importations, particularly of farm products, with increased prices to the consumer. These are not matters of speculation. They are clearly demonstrated facts.

I submit for the information of the Senate comparative tables of imports covering the months of October, November, and December of the years 1912 and 1913, showing the imports for the corresponding months of the two years. They cover sugar, grapes, olives, walnuts, raisins, lemons, almonds, eggs, oats, wheat, corn, cattle, and fresh meats.

Comparative table of imports.

	1912		1913		Per cent increase, quantity.
	Quantities.	Values.	Quantities.	Values.	
OCTOBER.					
Sugar:					
Beet, lbs., dut .....	110,708,202	\$2,667,790	40,000	\$1,838	190.00
Cane—					
Product of Philippine Islands, lbs. free.....	61,360,000	1,301,529	10,049,612	232,837	.....
All other, dut....	201,036,875	5,493,253	114,741,212	2,455,681	.....
Total cane....	262,396,875	6,794,782	124,790,824	2,688,518	152.00
NOVEMBER.					
Sugar:					
Beet, lbs., dut .....	12,629,022	265,867	114,900	3,246	190.00
Cane—					
Philippines, free.....	40,162,881	877,011	14,672,000	317,263	.....
All other, dut....	18,624,483	463,502	129,626,023	2,559,093	.....
Total cane....	58,787,364	1,340,513	144,298,023	2,876,356	145.00
DECEMBER.					
Sugar:					
Beet, lbs., dut .....	23,300,206	478,971	50,000	1,371	190.00
Cane—					
Philippines, free.....	34,943,747	897,993	1,120,000	23,910	.....
All other, dut....	33,299,438	802,344	93,939,719	1,995,091	.....
Total cane....	68,243,185	1,700,337	95,059,719	2,019,001	39.00

<sup>1</sup> Decrease.



Comparative table of imports—Continued.

	1912		1913		Per cent increase, quantity.
	Quantities.	Values.	Quantities.	Values.	
OCTOBER.					
Grapes, cu. ft., dut....	533,814	\$620,026	485,632	\$572,370	10.00
NOVEMBER.					
Grapes, cu. ft., dut....	522,714	619,572	674,262	793,603	29.00
DECEMBER.					
Grapes, cu. ft., dut....	29,244	37,603	94,634	117,590	223.00
OCTOBER.					
Olives, galls., dut.....	541,931	273,745	62,043	26,732	188.00
NOVEMBER.					
Olives, galls., dut.....	159,789	78,380	292,407	121,201	73.00
DECEMBER.					
Olives, galls., dut.....	286,969	139,152	369,597	163,719	30.00
OCTOBER.					
Walnuts, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	1,104,502	85,189	3,104,532	286,555	181.00
Shelled.....	519,406	91,210	604,361	125,985	16.00
NOVEMBER.					
Walnuts, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	8,161,024	702,592	10,982,207	961,937	34.50
Shelled.....	967,182	197,290	515,540	112,094	146.00
DECEMBER.					
Walnuts, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	3,353,785	270,407	6,991,658	568,349	108.00
Shelled.....	1,093,345	257,369	1,069,325	219,244	1.02
OCTOBER.					
Raisins, and other dried grapes, lbs., dut.....	705,166	82,270	1,122,434	101,473	59.00
NOVEMBER.					
Raisins, etc., lbs., dut..	695,937	83,185	794,873	89,773	14.00
DECEMBER.					
Raisins, etc., lbs., dut..	255,256	21,607	675,357	39,678	165.00
OCTOBER.					Per cent increase value. 204.00
Lemons, lbs., dut. <sup>2</sup> ....	3,430,756	100,148	.....	304,368	
NOVEMBER.					
Lemons, lbs., dut. <sup>2</sup> ....	2,910,820	72,128	.....	163,174	126.00
DECEMBER.					
Lemons, lbs., dut. <sup>2</sup> ....	4,428,163	97,831	.....	435,124	344.00
OCTOBER.					Per cent increase, quantity. 223.00
Almonds, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	737,086	57,377	2,383,849	271,431	3.50
Shelled.....	2,185,131	518,668	2,262,487	665,528	
NOVEMBER.					
Almonds, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	555,398	38,470	1,470,722	163,776	164.00
Shelled.....	2,248,005	528,440	1,855,020	559,226	117.00
DECEMBER.					
Almonds, lbs., dut.: Not shelled.....	591,863	61,250	566,127	66,186	1.04
Shelled.....	2,068,640	489,716	2,253,855	688,717	8.00
OCTOBER.					
Eggs, doz., free.....	.....	.....	21,594	5,322	.....
NOVEMBER.					
Eggs, doz., free.....	.....	.....	165,263	36,500	.....
DECEMBER.					
Eggs, doz., free.....	.....	.....	1,514,296	334,315	.....
OCTOBER.					
Oats, bush., dut.....	379	186	2,524,793	886,994	666,72.00
NOVEMBER.					
Oats, bush., dut.....	4,266	2,052	5,132,308	1,821,789	120,207.00

<sup>1</sup> Decrease.<sup>2</sup> Dutiable partly by package and quantity not stated after Oct. 4, 1913.

Comparative table of imports—Continued.

	1912		1913		Per cent increase, quantity.
	Quantities.	Values.	Quantities.	Values.	
DECEMBER.					
Oats, bush., dut.....	8,984	\$3,069	5,577,656	\$1,918,985	61,993.00
OCTOBER.					
Wheat, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	118	207	.....
Dut.....	52,213	29,510	233,099	213,276	.....
Total.....	52,213	29,510	233,217	213,483	346.00
NOVEMBER.					
Wheat, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	6	16	.....
Dut.....	2,187	2,152	127,033	107,011	.....
Total.....	2,187	2,152	127,039	107,027	5,708.00
DECEMBER.					
Wheat, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	40	48	.....
Dut.....	151,616	117,579	149,264	124,734	.....
Total.....	151,616	117,579	149,304	124,782	1.01
OCTOBER.					
Corn, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	473,259	378,011	.....
Dut.....	226,471	114,796	.....	.....	109.00
NOVEMBER.					
Corn, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	1,632,643	1,182,672	.....
Dut.....	25,819	21,567	.....	.....	6,223.00
DECEMBER.					
Corn, bush.: Free.....	.....	.....	2,343,444	1,485,397	.....
Dut.....	637	415	.....	.....	367,787.00
OCTOBER.					
Cattle, number: Free.....	34	3,710	130,639	3,398,037	.....
Dut.....	27,662	575,133	.....	.....	.....
Total number.....	27,696	578,843	130,639	3,398,067	371.00
NOVEMBER.					
Cattle, number: Free.....	32	2,975	123,118	3,306,723	.....
Dut.....	43,726	829,353	.....	.....	.....
Total number.....	43,758	829,358	123,118	3,306,723	181.00
DECEMBER.					
Cattle, number: Free.....	73	10,225	87,470	1,911,882	.....
Dut.....	40,449	600,344	.....	.....	.....
Total number.....	40,522	610,569	87,470	1,911,882	115.00
OCTOBER.					
Fresh meats: Beef and veal, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	5,677,461	466,987	.....
Mutton and lamb, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	60,047	5,452	.....
Pork, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	14,609	2,218	.....
Total pounds.....	.....	.....	5,752,207	474,657	.....
NOVEMBER.					
Fresh meats: Beef and veal, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	10,856,516	900,296	.....
Mutton and lamb, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	32,385	3,445	.....
Pork, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	109,832	17,332	.....
Total pounds.....	.....	.....	10,998,733	921,073	.....
DECEMBER.					
Fresh meats: Beef and veal, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	15,483,670	1,227,037	.....
Mutton and lamb, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	441,308	34,598	.....
Pork, lbs., free.....	.....	.....	104,211	14,321	.....
Total pounds.....	.....	.....	16,029,189	1,275,956	.....

<sup>1</sup> Decrease.

Mr. President, these are all farm products. I have not gone into any others. The tables show the quantity and value of the importations in the same months under the old and new tariff laws and the percentage of increase or decrease for the months following the enactment of the new tariff law commencing with the month of October.

The decreased importations of sugar is significant. The reduction of the duty on sugar did not take effect until March of this year. Therefore no more than absolutely necessary importations of sugar have been made. Foreign sugar will be withheld from shipment or in bond until the lower duty takes effect, when the accumulated supply will be loaded on our markets. The comparative statement as to the other products show a marked increase in nearly all of them, and in some of them the increase is enormous. Take for examples: Grapes, the increase runs from 29 per cent in November to 223 per cent in December. Olives, the greatest increase is in November, and reached 73 per cent. Walnuts, the duty is different on not shelled and shelled. On the unshelled the increase has run up to 181 per cent. On shelled walnuts there has been a decrease, greater in November, being 46 per cent, reduced in December to one-fiftieth of 1 per cent. Evidently importations will increase soon in this case as in the others. In the case of raisins the increase has run up to 165 per cent. Lemon importations have increased 344 per cent. This increase of importations was inevitable. In a speech made by me here when the tariff bill was under discussion I said, after a showing of the facts:

This shows that it costs the California grower \$1 more to grow a box of lemons and prepare it for shipment than it costs a grower in Italy. If we add to this the difference in the freight rate of 84 cents a box that our people must pay with that of 30 cents net that is paid by the importer of lemons from Italy, we have a difference of \$1.52 as the cost of production and freight on lemons to New York in favor of the foreign producer.

The duty imposed by the new tariff law is something less than 50 cents a box. The effect of this must be to give over to the importers of foreign lemons, so far as they are able to supply it, the entire eastern market of the country, and enable them to dictate prices when the domestic producer has been driven from the field. This will leave the home producers a limited market, that will prevent further extensions of the industry and render it unprofitable.

In the case of almonds, the increase for the three months has run as high as 223 per cent, depending on the season of the year. The tax of 5 cents a dozen on eggs was entirely taken off and this commonly used food placed on the free list. Under the 5-cent duty no importations were made. Since it was taken off large quantities have been imported, amounting in the month of December to 1,514,296 dozen, valued at \$334,315. Of these, in a letter received by me from the Chamber of Commerce of Petaluma, Cal., it is said:

There have arrived recently in the markets of the coast cities large shipments of eggs imported from China. These eggs cost the importers, we are informed, about 15 cents per dozen at this season of the year, enabling the importer to market them freely and at a handsome profit. They have been selling in San Francisco, Portland, Los Angeles, and other coast cities at a few cents under the price of American eggs, and are used largely by restaurants and bakeries.

The continued importation of Chinese eggs at the low cost quoted will, we are convinced, seriously affect, if not entirely destroy, the very great poultry industry of this section of California. Poultrymen in the Petaluma district alone produce annually upward of 12,000,000 dozen eggs, having a market value of \$3,000,000.

Our poultrymen have established the fact that the average cost of producing 1 dozen of the highest quality, large white eggs is 18 cents. To this cost must be added profit for the poultrymen as well as for the retailer. Thus it will be seen that whenever the producer has to sell his eggs under 20 cents he is losing money. He therefore can not compete with the Chinese eggs, and unless some means is found of preventing their importation the California poultrymen must face bankruptcy.

Our information is that the Chinese eggs are produced under conditions that render them unfit for human consumption. The object of this letter is to invite your cooperation in an investigation of this allegation, the purpose being, if the Chinese eggs are found to be unfit for use by the white race, to invoke the pure-food laws and have their importation prohibited.

This is a matter that affects the people of this community vitally, and your active cooperation in the movement here outlined will be fully appreciated.

Shipments of eggs from China have amounted up to January 1, 1914, to 177,935 dozen, and doubtless, as the market is now open, millions more will follow. This is a matter of serious consequence, not only to the State of California, but particularly to the Middle Western States, where this is an important industry.

In the case of oats, the increase in importations has ranged from 61.998 per cent to 666.072 per cent. Wheat has gone to 5,708 per cent; corn from 25,819 bushels to 1,632,643 bushels in November and from 637 bushels to 2,343,444 bushels in December. In the case of cattle, as shown by the statement above, the increase has ranged from 115 to 371 per cent; and in the case of fresh meats of the various kinds, the importations have ad-

vanced from nothing under the old tariff to a total of 16,029,189 pounds under the new.

This shows a very serious surrender of our markets to foreign importers. If it were justified by a decrease of cost of these products to the consumer there would be at least a show of justice in the legislation that has brought this about. But there is no such justification or excuse.

Now, Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the other side of the question. Has the consumer benefited by these losses of the home producers or does he pay as much or more for what he gets, to the greater profit of the foreign importers? The conclusive answer to this inquiry comes from the same source. Bulletin 138 of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, comparing the months of September and October, 1912 and 1913, and summarizing prices of food from 1890 to 1913, is as follows:

#### RETAIL PRICES OF FOOD, 1890 TO OCTOBER, 1913.

Bulletin No. 138, soon to be issued by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows retail prices of the principal articles of food in each of 40 important cities throughout the United States. This bulletin is one of the bureau's regular series on retail prices. It shows actual prices for September and October, 1913, and September and October, 1912, and also summarizes retail prices for the period from 1890 to October, 1913.

Comparing retail prices on October 15, 1913, with prices on the same date 1912, 13 of the 15 articles for which quotations are given advanced and 2 declined in price. Potatoes advanced 42.3 per cent, eggs advanced 14.2 per cent, round steak advanced 12.9 per cent, ham advanced 10.6 per cent, rib roast advanced 8.8 per cent, sirloin steak advanced 8.3 per cent, bacon advanced 8.2 per cent, hens advanced 7.5 per cent, pork chops advanced 6.3 per cent, butter advanced 3.7 per cent, milk advanced 2.7 per cent, corn meal advanced 1.7 per cent, and lard advanced 1 per cent. Sugar declined 8.8 per cent and flour declined 2.6 per cent.

When the price of each of the articles of food is weighted, according to average consumption in workingmen's families, retail prices were at a higher level on October 15, 1913, than at any other time during the last 23 years and 10 months. Retail prices of food on October 15, 1913, were 70.9 per cent above the average price for the 10-year period, 1890 to 1899; 7.9 per cent above the price on October 15, 1912, and 16.9 per cent above the price on October 15, 1911.

The cities for which actual prices are shown are Atlanta, Ga.; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Boston, Mass.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Charleston, S. C.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Detroit, Mich.; Fall River, Mass.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Kansas City, Mo.; Little Rock, Ark.; Los Angeles, Cal.; Louisville, Ky.; Manchester, N. H.; Memphis, Tenn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Newark, N. J.; New Haven, Conn.; New Orleans, La.; New York, N. Y.; Omaha, Neb.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Portland, Ore.; Providence, R. I.; Richmond, Va.; St. Louis, Mo.; St. Paul, Minn.; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Francisco, Cal.; Scranton, Pa.; Seattle, Wash.; and Washington, D. C.

Bulletin 140 of the same kind and from the same source, but covering comparison of prices at retail for the months of November and December and containing the general summary as before, contains the following:

Comparing retail prices on December 15, 1913, with prices on the same date in 1912, 12 of the 15 articles for which quotations are given advanced and 3 declined in price. Potatoes advanced 43.7 per cent, fresh eggs advanced 21.9 per cent, pork chops advanced 16.8 per cent, round steak advanced 13.1 per cent, rib roast advanced 10 per cent, sirloin steak advanced 8.9 per cent, ham advanced 7.9 per cent, hens advanced 6.7 per cent, corn meal advanced 6.6 per cent, bacon advanced 4.5 per cent, milk advanced 1.9 per cent, and lard advanced 0.7 per cent. Sugar declined 8.6 per cent, butter declined 2.9 per cent, and flour declined 0.6 per cent.

When the price of each of the 15 articles of food is weighted according to average consumption in workingmen's families, retail prices were at a higher level on December 15, 1913, than at any other time during the 24 years preceding, with the single exception of November 15, 1913, when they reached the maximum of 72.8 per cent above the average for 1890 to 1899. Retail prices of food on December 15, 1913, were 71.7 per cent above the average price for the 10-year period 1890 to 1899; 9 per cent above the price on December 15, 1912; and 14.5 per cent above the price on December 15, 1911.

I have been unable to trace the comparative prices to consumers of all of the articles mentioned in the tables I have presented. No account of them is made in any of the departments of the Government except those mentioned in the above bulletins. But I have ascertained the effect of the low tariff on lemons and the consequent increased importations of that fruit. The tariff was reduced more than two-thirds. The duty was made so low that, so far as the markets of the eastern cities are concerned, they might just as well have been put on the free list so far as it affects the home producers. The above tables show that it has brought about an enormous increase of importations. The alleged reason for reducing the duty on lemons was to reduce the price to the consumer. But just the opposite effect has been produced, as might have been known. We were unwise enough to give up our own markets to foreign importers and thus place our own producers and the consumers at their mercy. The result so far is that a comparison of the retail prices of 27 representative cities for the months of October, November, and December, 1912, and the same months of 1913, the former under the old tariff law and the latter under the new, shows that instead of reducing the price of lemons to the consumer the price has increased 3 cents a dozen. I have no



doubt that if the data could be gathered it would show a like effect of the reduction of duties on other fruits and other articles produced in California.

So, Mr. President, we have an increase of importations by which our people are losing their home market and prices to the consumers steadily increasing. This proves that what is taken from domestic producers does not go to consumers, but redounds to the benefit of the importers of foreign goods, or middlemen, and ultimately the evil effects of such legislation reaches the man who labors to produce the domestic article in the form of lower wages and often the loss of employment. It is not a pleasing prospect.

But to make matters worse, while our home producers are being rapidly crowded out of the market and prices to the consumer are climbing higher and higher instead of being reduced by the reduction of the tariff, as the people were promised, the Government is losing millions of dollars of revenue on account of the reduced duties on foreign goods. The following figures furnished by the Treasury Department tell the melancholy story:

Customs:		Customs:	
Oct., 1913	\$30,138,049.37	Oct., 1912	\$30,216,824.02
Nov., 1913	21,173,627.85	Nov., 1912	25,666,353.25
Dec., 1913	21,510,139.99	Dec., 1912	24,248,161.30
Jan., 1914	23,528,079.83	Jan., 1913	29,334,124.09
Total	96,349,897.04	Total	109,465,462.66

This shows that for the four months following the enactment of the new tariff law the Government lost the considerable sum of \$13,115,565.62. At this rate, which will grow greater rather than less, the Government stands to lose \$39,346,696.86, not including the loss from putting sugar on the free list.

But this is only a small proportion of the loss in revenue that will result from the act. The revenue derived from the duty on sugar in 1912 was \$50,951,199. It is estimated that reduction in the duty on sugar, which has now taken effect, will reduce the income from sugar to \$40,196,000, making a loss of \$10,755,199. The revenue derived from duty on wool from 1912 was \$48,361,374. The estimate of receipts under the present law as now in force is \$35,745,000, making a loss of \$12,616,374. But wool did not go on the free list until December, 1913, and therefore the figures of the Treasury Department, showing a loss of \$13,115,565.62 for the four months, includes only two months of the loss on wool. With the full amount of the loss from placing both wool and sugar on the free list, we shall have a total loss upon those two articles of \$99,314,573, and the total loss of revenue will amount to \$130,598,907.86.

So, Mr. President, while this law is in force no one will be benefited in the least by this great loss except foreign importers, and both our producers and consumers will lose even more; and Democratic politicians are actually trying to make the people of the country believe this is a good law and in their interest. They might hope to succeed but for the actual figures that can not be disputed.

#### THE INCOME-TAX LAW.

The income-tax law was made necessary by the reduction of the duties on foreign goods. In other words, the people of the country are compelled to make up in direct taxation what the Government loses by a reduction of the duties. This proves the insincerity of the Democratic doctrine of a tariff, not for protection of our home industry, but for revenue only. If the tariff is for revenue, it should be made to produce the revenues needed. There was no excuse, in this view of it, for placing on the free list articles that produced revenue and could not in any way affect the price of the articles to the consumer, or for reducing duties that worked no injury to anybody at home. This was done in many instances. The taxpayers of the country do not relish the idea of making up in direct taxation for the mistake of a Democratic administration of a useless reduction of tariff rates that does no one any good except the importers of foreign goods. The provision requiring the withholding of moneys due to taxpayers, without their consent, at the source is peculiarly offensive and has caused much unfavorable comment. The whole act was made so complicated and unsatisfactory that Democratic officials have been busy ever since it was enacted trying to explain its provisions sufficiently to enable people who desired to comply with its requirements to make the necessary statement of their incomes. These complications, difficulties, and embarrassments will not be kindly tolerated by people who are, without reason, called upon to assume the burdens of direct taxation only because of the reduction of tariff duties.

It is too early to say whether the amount realized from direct taxation will make up the deficiencies resulting from the tariff reductions. It is being whispered about that the actual collections from incomes will fall far short of the estimates on which the bill was founded and that the loss of tariff revenues and the

shortage under the income-tax law will result in a deficiency in the Treasury. The great falling off of revenues derived from tariff duties is a certainty. The effect upon this condition of collections under the income-tax law can not now be determined. If the people shall be compelled to bear the burden of income taxes and the revenues still fall short of the needed amount, their dissatisfaction at being thus unnecessarily burdened will be increased.

The imposition of an income tax is attempted to be justified on the ground that the man who makes more than \$4,000 a year should bear a greater share in proportion of the burdens of taxation than the man who makes less. That is true if we have reached a time in this country when we are willing, and believe it to be just, to penalize a citizen for being frugal, enterprising, and prosperous. I believe we have reached a point where immense incomes, not acquired by thrift and industry, but by the mere accumulation of millions without effort, should be penalized. Such vast accumulations of wealth should be discouraged and prevented if possible. But this does not apply to the smaller incomes produced by legitimate industry and enterprise and right business or other pursuits open to an American citizen. Such efforts should be encouraged, not penalized. With such, as compared with those realizing a lesser income, the burdens of Government should be equal. Whether an income-tax law is justifiable or not under a Government like ours, where it is necessary to increase the revenues, may be a matter of doubt. But in this case it was only made necessary by a reduction of tariff revenues that was entirely unnecessary and unjustifiable. And everybody knows that an additional burden of taxation imposed on any business is carried on to the consumers or the employees of the business. So at last the latter are compelled to carry it.

#### THE CURRENCY BILL.

The banking and currency bill was another sore disappointment to most of those who really understood its provisions. The people generally do not understand it or how its passage was brought about. The interests, the bankers and others, who succeeded in having their way about it, have seen to it that the newspapers, generally subsidized by these interests, make it appear to be in the interest of the general public. Some legislation on this subject was demanded chiefly for the purpose of freeing the public from the domination and control of Wall Street and the national banking interest. This law, instead of having this effect, so generally desired, has placed the country more firmly in the grip of those interests, by placing in their hands and under their management and control the immense power of the regional banks with their millions of capital and deposits.

Whether this law results in any benefit to the people must therefore depend entirely upon the conduct of bankers who manage them. The Government is given no adequate or efficient control over them, and the people none at all. Private individuals are allowed to take stock in the banks only in case the existing banks do not take it all, and even then their stock is denied any voting power. They have no right to participate in the election of the directors or other officers of the banks. This power is given over completely to the banks, to the exclusion of the private holders of stock. One of the leading magazines, speaking in commendation of the bill, very truly said:

They will be banks of banks—banks owned by banks, conducted primarily by banks, and doing business only with banks.

They are not Government banks. They are not people's banks. They are banks' banks. If that is what the people of this country want, then the law is a good one that gives them what they want. But it was not what Congress wanted. The passage of it was an abject surrender to Wall Street and the banking interests. A Democratic Senator, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, declared on the floor of the Senate, when the bill was on its passage, that unless it was passed in that form the banks would not support it. It could not have been passed except under the coercion of a secret caucus. The issue between Government and bank control was sharply drawn. The Committee on Banking and Currency, composed of 12 members, was evenly divided on the subject, 5 Republicans and 1 Democrat reporting in favor of Government control with the right of the people to subscribe the stock, and 6 Democrats for bank control and the denial of the right of the people to subscribe for the stock. A majority of the Senate was undoubtedly opposed to bank control, but in a caucus a majority of the Democratic Senators could be induced to support it. Why? Because if they did not the banks would not come into the system, and the Democratic Party must pass some kind of a banking and currency bill to satisfy the public demand. A majority of the Democrats could bind the others in a secret caucus, and, thus bound, the bill could be and was



passed. It was in this way that they surrendered completely to the banks, and the banks have come into the scheme with the greatest pleasure.

The people are deceived into the belief that the banks will be under the control of the Government because a reserve board is provided for, to be appointed by the President. This is a fallacious belief. The law provides specifically that "every Federal reserve bank shall be conducted under the supervision and control of a board of directors." It also provides how the board shall be selected. They are divided into classes A, B, and C. "Class A shall consist of three members, who shall be chosen by and be representative of the stockholding banks. Class B shall consist of three members, who, at the time of their election, shall be actively engaged in their district in commerce, agriculture, or some other industrial pursuit." They also are selected by the banks. It seems to be supposed that to require the three class B directors to be engaged in commercial business "at the time of their election" will in some way safeguard the public interests. I do not see how. They are not forbidden to be bankers, and need not continue in commercial pursuits. They are selected by the banks and will no doubt be controlled by them. "Class C shall consist of three members, who shall be designated by the Federal Reserve Board." That is to say, the banks have two-thirds of the members of the board of directors and the Government one-third. Not much Government control in that situation. It should not be overlooked that one of the directors chosen by the reserve board is required to be a banker, or, as the bill says, "of tested banking experience." It is too evident to need comment that these provisions of the act were made in the interest of the banks and at their dictation. The provision giving the banks full control of the regional banks was forced into the act by the threats of bankers that they would not come into the scheme if they were not given control of the new banks and the Democratic Party bowed to the will of Wall Street and the interests, and gave them control.

The Federal Reserve Board is composed of seven members, two of whom are the Treasurer and Comptroller of the Currency. The other five members, two of whom must be, and all may be, bankers, are required to give their whole time to the work. The powers of the reserve board are specifically stated in the law. I undertake to say that they are no greater or more effective than the power and control of the Secretary of the Treasury and Comptroller of the Currency over national banks under the national banking laws. The board has a general supervision of the reserve banks and may suspend and reorganize any one of the banks for cause, but this is no more than the comptroller can do in the case of national banks. The fact still remains that the business of the banks, their daily transactions, will be, must be, governed and controlled by the national banks who hold their stock and elect two-thirds of their directors. It is bank ownership and control with Government supervision and regulation just as in case of national banks.

The banks and bankers who own and control the reserve banks may make them instruments for the public good. Whether they will or not remains to be seen. Experience teaches us that they will whenever it is to their own interests as well as the interests of the public, but not otherwise. The powerful banking interests have been the friends, financial agents, and supporters of the great trusts. They will continue to be so under the reserve-banking law with the added power the new banks give them. The law affords no protection against this use of their power. It is suggested that the establishment of the regional banks will, or I had better say may, serve to break up the enormous reserves held in the great banks in New York and Chicago and distribute them to different parts of the country. Let us hope that at least this expectation will be realized to some extent. But at best it can only be to a very limited extent when the enormous financial and business transactions of the country are considered. The overpowering influence of the great financial institutions of New York will undoubtedly continue to control and dominate the situation in the future as they have in the past unless prevented by other laws, notwithstanding this new banking law. This command of the situation might be overcome, at least in part, by laws severing the connection of banking institutions and the trusts and utility corporations. But this bill not only does not do anything of this kind, but leaves the banks at full liberty to promote and support these offending aggregations of wealth and strengthens their power in this respect by turning over to them the reserve banks.

Mr. President, there is another phase of this question that has received but little attention, and that is the enormous cost to the public of establishing and maintaining the reserve banks. According to my observation since I have been a Member of

the Senate the matter of cost, when the people must foot the bills, does not, as a rule, receive very serious consideration. The bill provides for at least 8 reserve banks, with the privilege on the part of the reserve board to increase the number to 12. No doubt the number will be increased to the limit. It is ever so when additional Government agencies are provided for. Let us, for the purpose in hand, take the minimum and not the maximum number. But there is something more coming. The bill provides:

Each Federal reserve bank shall establish branch banks within the Federal reserve district in which it is located and may do so in the district of any Federal reserve bank which may have been suspended. Such branches shall be operated by a board of directors under rules and regulations approved by the Federal Reserve Board. Directors of branch banks shall possess the same qualifications as directors of the Federal reserve banks. Four of said directors shall be selected by the reserve bank and three by the Federal Reserve Board, and they shall hold office during the pleasure, respectively, of the parent bank and the Federal Reserve Board. The reserve bank shall designate one of the directors as manager.

Under this section the reserve banks are compelled to establish branch banks within their respective districts, and the number that may be set up is not limited. Each of these must have seven directors, and four, or a majority of them, are selected by the banks, thus giving them the control of the branches. Now, suppose we consider, just a little, the cost of it all. Whatever the cost is, it must be borne by the people, who are forbidden to exercise any control of the banks or their branches. It is a new burden placed upon the business of the country. To begin with, we have the salaries of the members of the reserve board. Five of the members receive \$12,000 a year and traveling expenses. There is added to the salary of the Comptroller of the Currency, as extra compensation for his work on the board, \$7,000. So we have an expense, for the salaries of the members of the reserve board alone, of \$67,000 a year. This does not include the traveling expenses, rents, office force, fees for attorneys that the board is authorized to employ, and a multitude of other expenses. Congress knows only too well how they grow and multiply. It is fair to say that the expense of this board alone will amount to \$100,000 a year. This is a very moderate estimate. Then we have at least eight banks and the same number of branch banks. The former may be increased by four and the latter without limit. The banks must have a board of nine and the branches seven directors, with a president for each, with cashiers, clerks, bookkeepers, and the many other officers and employees necessary to man a bank, all of whom must be paid. Then banking houses must be provided and furnished, and all other expenses of maintaining and carrying on the numerous banks and branches must be met. To add to the unnecessary and already enormous expenses, an advisory council of 1 from each reserve district, 8 or 12, as the case may be—probably 12—is provided for, "who shall receive such compensation and allowances as may be fixed by his board of directors, subject to the approval of the Federal Reserve Board."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there for an observation? Does not the Senator realize that all the expense of the reserve banks will have to be paid out of the profits of the reserve banks; that those profits will accrue from the reserves of the national banks and the capital which they put into the reserve banks; and that, consequently, so far as that feature of the question is concerned, it is no expense whatever to the Government?

Mr. WORKS. I was just coming to that.

How much this may be we do not know, but bankers come high, and we may be sure the amount paid for advice from gentlemen distinguished for their ability to give it will not be small. It will be seen readily that all this runs up into the millions every year. It will be said that the expenses will be paid out of the earnings of the banks. But, sir, from whom are these earnings derived, and who receives the profits? The earnings come from and are a burden on the business of the country, and are ultimately charged up to and paid by the ultimate consumers and contribute to the high cost of living. Besides the expenses, they are taxed with the profits, which go to the banks, up to 6 per cent. If anything more is made, then and then only does the Government derive any benefit from it. If the banks make more than 6 per cent profit, then the burden is excessive and should not be allowed. The incidental benefit to the Government of the excessive profits can not meet the heavy expenses borne by the country, and if it does it amounts to a direct tax on the people and is unjust and inexcusable. The matter of profits is thus provided for in the act:

After all necessary expenses of a Federal reserve bank have been paid or provided for the stockholders shall be entitled to receive an annual dividend of 6 per cent on the paid-in capital stock, which dividend shall be cumulative. After the aforesaid dividend claims



have been fully met, all of the net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax, except that one-half of such net earnings shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 40 per cent of the paid-in capital stock of such bank.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does not the Senator recognize that whatever charge there may be it will not be upon the individual borrower? No individual can go to a Federal reserve bank and borrow a dollar. The new system has been created for the purpose of relieving runs upon the banks; it is the banks that will have to pay; and, consequently, the burden will be no greater than the demand which will be made by the banks.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is altogether mistaken. You must trace these expenses back to the people who support the banks by the payment of interest and otherwise. The loans that are secured from the national banks and other banks are carried on the books of the reserve banks, and therefore the people support them.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but these banks—

Mr. WORKS. Well, Mr. President, I shall have to decline to be interrupted further. I am perfectly willing to answer any questions, but I do not want to indulge in a discussion of the matter at this point.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, it is claimed for the act that it will provide a sufficient reserve fund from which to draw in case of need and thereby prevent money panics. Under the present law every national bank is required to maintain in its vaults a reserve that has been regarded as sufficient to meet such emergencies. It has not been the fault of the law that depositors and others have not been protected in this way. It has been largely, if not entirely, the fault of the banks and bankers.

It has been the policy of the banks whenever a money stringency occurred, or was even threatened, to add to it by withholding further loans, drawing in those already made, and hoarding their money by the millions when business and personal demands of the people, whose money they held in their vaults and who were entitled to receive it, needed to have it. Their methods in this respect were most arbitrary and unjust. It was cowardly. They were afraid, and their fears added to the scare and precipitated the panic that they should, and generally could, have avoided. Now, it is proposed to take the money of these same banks, not other or additional money, and put it into other banks and expect thereby to change the timid natures of the bankers and avoid panics. And to make that result perfectly sure we put the new banks and reserves in the hands of these same bankers to operate and control. They will doubtless control these banks just about as they have the others, making a sure profit for themselves and rendering the banks useless as public agencies when they are most needed. The money paid for the stock of the new banks, it must be understood, is paid out of the money of the old banks. It is simply a transfer of the money from one set of banks to the other. It is quite true that if a single bank should get into financial difficulties it could unload its securities onto the reserve banks under this law, thus securing the cash it needs without drawing in its loans. But this aid is now almost uniformly extended to such banks by other banks in the vicinity for their own protection. This is a condition easily met without the aid of this law. When the panic is general and banks all over the country are threatened the reserve banks will be just as helpless as the others. About the only good this law will do in this particular will be to stiffen up the backbones of the bankers, give them courage, and thereby avoid the panics that their own fears bring on. But when the test comes and the law and the reserve banks fail of their object this effect will be gone.

The provision for issuing reserve notes, for which securities must be furnished by the reserve banks, is an aid to be extended by the Government, and will, in case of necessity, be helpful. But this elaborate and expensive banking system was wholly unnecessary for that purpose. The National Treasury has for years extended aid by way of advancing money in case of stringency and threatened panic. All that was necessary was amendments to the then law authorizing the Treasury Department to extend such aid. In fact, this whole matter of giving needed relief in case of panic should have been vested in the Government through its lawfully constituted departments. If a bank should have been necessary as a means to this end, it could have been provided for and made a branch of the Treasury Department. Thus we could have accomplished everything that can be accomplished under this law with one-hundredth part of the expense and with far greater safety. But that would not have furnished salaries to hundreds of bankers and others or 6 per cent interest to

the banks, that the people must pay in the end, either directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, this law is not in the interest of the public, but of the bankers. They get most all of the salaries and the profits. The people get nothing but the hope that it may prevent a panic maybe once in 10 years. For this they pay millions of dollars every year. If the President and Congress had possessed the courage to do what the majority wanted to do and knew ought to be done, namely, establish one strong central bank, the stock to be subscribed by the people instead of the banks, that could meet impartially any financial trouble that might arise anywhere all over the country, the administration would have done at least one thing in the public interest. But our Democratic friends lacked the courage of their convictions. They surrendered to the banks, and the people must suffer the consequences.

#### RAID ON CIVIL SERVICE.

One of the worst features of the two important laws I have been considering—the tariff, including the income-tax law, and the banking and currency act—is their deliberate attempt to limit and eventually overthrow the civil-service laws, rules, and regulations. In the income-tax law it is provided in terms that appointments of the force of agents, deputy collectors, inspectors, and other employees shall be made by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, thus throwing this army of employees open to the spoils system. The Republican Members of Congress earnestly protested against this breaking down of the classified service. Several amendments were offered by Republican Senators to bring these appointments under the classified service, but they were all voted down by Democratic votes. There was no reason for taking these employees out of the civil service except to give the jobs to Democrats for political purposes. There are something like 300 of these employees thus placed under the spoils system, instead of subjecting them to competitive examinations and appointing them on their merits by the Civil Service Commission. The same controversy arose over the banking and currency bill. The Republicans in the Senate again contended that the large number of subordinate employees made necessary by the act should be selected from the classified list under the civil-service laws. This was voted down. But our Democratic friends were beginning to be a little timid of public sentiment. The income-tax law in this particular had been strongly and very generally condemned as a raid on the civil service. So they compromised. They wanted the jobs. They wanted them awfully bad. There were so many of their constituents clamoring for jobs that they needed some places to put them. They lacked the courage to take the employees to be appointed out of the civil service, so they provided:

All such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, and other employees shall be appointed without regard to the provisions of the act of January 16, 1883 (vol. 22, U. S. Stat. L., p. 403), and amendments thereto, or any rule or regulation made in pursuance thereof.

The act referred to in this clause is the act establishing the civil service. Therefore the civil-service law, rules, and regulations are expressly set aside by the act and the employees, that will run up into the hundreds, opened to the spoils system. But in order to save their faces and avoid public censure the Democrats, pressed by the protests of Republican Members, inserted the clause:

*Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent the President from placing said employees in the classified service.

This was an unworthy shifting of the responsibility to the President. After declaring, in express terms, that the appointments should not be subject to the civil-service law they said that notwithstanding Congress had provided it should not be done the President might place them in the classified service. The country, and especially the great mass of the people who detest the spoils system and believe in the civil service, will await with interest the action or nonaction of the President under this proviso.

The urgent deficiency bill furnishes another case of the same kind. When the bill was on its passage the following rider was offered by a Democratic Member of the House and passed both Houses and became a part of the law:

All Executive orders heretofore made placing the positions of deputy marshals and deputy internal-revenue collectors in the classified service, and all regulations made thereunder, are hereby revoked, and hereafter appointments to said positions shall be made in the same manner as obtained prior to the making of such Executive orders.

The author of the amendment made the following frank statement of the reason for offering it:

I know that there is no office, in my judgment, under Democratic administration that could not be better filled by a Democrat than by a Republican. If you can call that the spoils system, you are welcome to so denominate it.



The amendment was subsequently enlarged so as to allow collectors and marshals to discharge all subordinate employees in addition to deputies, and to appoint their successors without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations.

The National Civil Service Reform League telegraphed the President, protesting against this further invasion of the civil service, as follows:

On behalf of the National Civil Service Reform League I earnestly urge that you veto urgent deficiency appropriation bill, because of provision exempting from civil-service law subordinates of collectors of internal revenue and marshals. Provision affects not only deputies, but all subordinates of collectors and marshals, and is a vicious attack on merit system through rider legislation.

In reply the President said:

I am convinced, after a careful examination of the facts, that the offices of deputy collector and deputy marshal were never intended to be included under the ordinary provisions of the civil-service law.

In commenting on this case the North American Review said:

Why did President Wilson permit this backward step to be taken? That is the question. By a nod of his head he could have beaten it in the House of Representatives, where a change of only three votes would have prevented its passage. But no intimation was forthcoming, and the obnoxious "rider" was made a law of the land by the signature at the bottom of "Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States," to which should have been added, for the making of a complete record, "Former vice president of the National Civil Service Reform League."

But, Mr. President, the evident intent of the Democratic Party to break down and destroy the civil service has been manifested in other ways than by direct legislative enactment. There are thousands of assistant postmasters in the country now under the classified service. The Democratic House deliberately attempted to remove all these from that service and make the offices the prey of the hungry office seekers. And I have no doubt that this would have been done but for the fact that the wave of indignation and protest all over the country was such that no political party could ignore it, and the President and Postmaster General were forced by public sentiment to call off this further raid on the civil service. And, as I shall show further along, the President's word is law to this Democratic Congress.

It is singular that this should have occurred under the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, former vice president of the National Civil Service Reform League, and now claiming to be the head and leader of the Democratic Party. The platform of that party declares:

The law pertaining to the civil service should be honestly and rightly enforced, to the end that merit and ability shall be the standard of appointment and promotion, rather than service rendered to a political party.

That was worthy of a great reform party, and it sounds well. But it was no better than this declaration in a letter from the President to the National Civil Service Reform League as late as October 22, 1913:

My warm advocacy and support both of the principle and of the bona fide practice of civil-service reform is known to the whole country, and there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance.

Again the President said, in speaking of the civil-service act:

The President may accept its directions or not, as he pleases. The only force that can hold him to the observance of its principles is the force of public opinion.

Public opinion was not strong enough to "hold him to the observance of its principles" when the question was squarely presented to him by the income-tax act, the banking and currency act, and the urgent deficiency act. They were all most flagrant violations of the principles of the civil service. Protests were urged, amongst others, by the National Civil Service League against this breach of the law. He approved them, notwithstanding his declaration that "there is no danger that the spoils system will creep in with my approval or connivance." I do not know that he connived at this invasion of the civil-service law, in advance, but he did approve it by signing all of the bills with these objectionable provisions in them—provisions that would have been omitted, as in case of assistant postmasters, if he had said the word.

There is another thing that shows with equal clearness that the spoils system has crept in with the approval and by the act of the President himself. There has been much criticism and unfavorable comment in respect of the appointment of Democrats to diplomatic and consular posts. They constitute the most flagrant abuses of the merit system of appointment. To the higher places most of the favored ones were probably appointed because of their large contributions to the Democratic campaign fund or their political activity, others on the ground of personal friendship. I think it can fairly be said that none of them were appointed on merit alone. That is not to say that they are not good men; but they were in most, if not all, cases inexperienced, and for that reason would have been unfit under any fair rule of appointment on merit.

The able editor of the North American Review, himself a Democrat, has this to say on this subject, under the heading "Political debauchery in Latin America":

We come now to the branch of the Diplomatic Service whose reformation upon a higher plane, initiated by Secretary Hay and scrupulously safeguarded by Secretary Root and Secretary Knox, with the full approval of Presidents McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft, reflects the highest credit upon the Republican Party—and, alas, the scene changes. We refer, of course, to the Latin-American missions, obviously the most delicate and difficult of all in the present state of our relationship to the smaller Republics of the Western Hemisphere. It was to the changes in these posts that President Elliot took exception in his report to the Civil Service Reform League.

He then proceeds to compare the men appointed with those displaced by them, showing the superior qualifications of the old officers as compared with the new, and concludes:

The average experience of the former ministers to these South and Central American Republics was 15½ years, and their average age at the time of their expulsion was 47. All spoke the language of the countries to which they were accredited. The average age of the new ministers is 54½, five being past 60; no one of them, we believe, understands Spanish; and none, of course, has had diplomatic experience. In other words, 12 trained and capable representatives, several of whom entered the service under competitive examinations and all of whom had long since forsaken partisanship, are superseded by mere party hacks whose ages clearly disqualify them for continuance in office for sufficient time to equip themselves for proper performance of their duties. A clearer case of partisan political debauchery can not be imagined.

This is a fair statement of the case. It is none too strong. It presents a sad case of the spoils system in its worst form. The victors are given the spoils. No more aggravated case of the iniquitous spoils system of rewarding politicians for political work done could be conceived. If Andrew Jackson has been permitted to look down on the performance he must have smiled his approval. Unless he has reformed in the beyond, he must have been delighted at the spectacle.

#### PATRONAGE.

Akin to the question of the civil service is that of patronage. The law providing for the examination of applicants for positions under the Government and appointments on their merits was intended as far as possible to put an end to the disgraceful and demoralizing spoils system under which places were given out by successful politicians as rewards for party or personal political services. The wisdom of such a law was never more fully exemplified than by the scramble for office and place under the present administration and the manner in which the places have been filled. There never was a more partisan administration of the Government than the present one. I have already pointed out its unfortunate lowering of the Diplomatic and Consular Service. It has been even more deadly in its effects upon the service generally. I can not, I need not, go into details of the demands for places under the Government and the methods resorted to to obtain them. Every Member of this body has been witness to it, especially the Democratic Members who have suffered most from it, and who, I am sure, deplore it as much as I do, although because of the system of appointments that prevails they have been forced to become parties to it.

Mr. President, I have offered a remedy for much of the evil flowing from this disgraceful and degrading condition. I have offered a bill providing for a commission to sift out the applicants for appointments and recommend to the President the best man for appointment in each case, and forbidding Members of Congress to recommend or aid in securing the appointment of anyone to office, and also forbidding anyone to apply to them for aid or recommendation. The bill is so manifestly in the interest of the President, of Members of Congress, and of the public service that I had hoped the Democratic majority would take it up and pass it. But, like hundreds of other meritorious bills, it slumbers in committee without action upon it one way or the other. The necessity of some such law was borne in upon me just lately by one typical case. Under the income-tax law, which, as I have pointed out, provides for appointments in internal-revenue offices, under the spoils system perpetuated in the income-tax law, there were a number to be appointed under one of the collectors of internal revenue in California. The appointments could not be made by the collector, who was responsible for the conduct of the office. They must be made by the commissioner at Washington, who, of course, knew nothing of the merits or competency of the applicants for the places. The collector happened to be an old-time friend of mine, and he wrote me that he had recommended certain people for appointment to places under him and asked me to try to have the commissioner appoint them, as he had selected them for their competency and efficiency. I wrote to the commissioner, saying, in substance, that I knew the collector well and that he could be trusted to select the right kind of people to serve under him, and that he would be responsible for the conduct of the



office, that he must handle millions of dollars, and had given a large bond, and therefore his recommendations might well be followed. This polite communication did not meet with the courtesy of a reply. Much to my astonishment, I learned a few days later that the Democratic Members of the House from California had claimed these appointments as part of their patronage and had named the people they wanted the commissioner to appoint, all different from those recommended by the collector. I took up the matter with one of the Members of Congress and protested earnestly against this manner of imposing employees on a public official as rewards for political work. He finally said he would give up one of his places to the collector, thus allowing him one employee of his own selection. There were 15 or 16 to be appointed. I again wrote the commissioner, protesting against this mode of farming out places in the public service. This letter was not quite as polite as the first one, because I was indignant, but it met with a like fate. It was not answered. What has been done about the appointments I have not been informed.

I hope, Mr. President, that this is an extreme case and that there is none other so bad. But this one shows quite conclusively the evil effects of placing these appointments, hundreds of them, under the dishonored spoils system instead of the civil service. It is a serious reflection on this administration that opportunity for such methods should have been authorized by law.

#### THE SECRET CAUCUS.

Mr. President, I come now to a brief consideration of the secret caucus as a means of promoting or enforcing legislation. It is a fit companion to the spoils system of appointments. It does not pass laws on their merits. It forces them through almost always against the judgment and conscience of a majority of the legislative body, because if the majority favors any given measure no caucus rule is necessary. It is not new, but it is none the less a great evil. In this administration it has assumed its worst form. It has been resorted to perhaps more frequently, under more objectionable circumstances and in less excusable cases, than ever before. There is some excuse for caucus rule in case of purely political questions or in the election of officers of a legislative body, but there is none whatever when legislation involving vital principles or any other nonpolitical question is concerned. In such cases it is vicious and inexcusable. This has been the most prominent and most unfortunate feature of legislation under this administration. Neither the tariff bill nor the banking and currency bill would have been passed in the form in which they were enacted but for the coercive use and effect of the secret Democratic caucus. We would not have had on the free list many of the articles placed there by this act, and the reductions in other cases would have been kept within reasonable limits and not made destructive of our home industries as they are now. Neither would Congress have bowed the knee and surrendered to the moneyed interests of the country the ownership and control of the reserve banks with the enormous power that goes with them.

There is another feature of the secret caucus, as used in this administration, that intensifies and multiplies its evil effects. They have not been the free and voluntary actions of even a majority of the Democrats of either House of Congress. The power of the executive department has forced caucus action with the very purpose of coercing Members of Congress to do the will of the President in the passage of laws. So we have two illegitimate forces at work to circumvent the majority in Congress and compel the enactment of important legislation against their will. It is not a pleasant thing to think about. Such methods have no legitimate place in the making of laws in a free Republic. The independence of every American citizen should rise up against it.

#### EXECUTIVE DOMINATION OF CONGRESS.

Mr. President, I come now to comment on what I consider one of the most important of the questions that are confronting Congress to-day, if not the most important of them all, and that is the evident purpose of the Executive to dominate and control the legislative branch of the Government. I have had occasion to speak of it before and since this administration came into power. It was bad enough under previous administrations, but in this one it has increased a hundredfold over anything that has been known in the past. This dominating influence has become so insistent and continuous, and has been submitted to so slavishly by the majority of Congress, that the independence and usefulness of the legislative branch of the Government are both threatened. It has been so asserted and exercised and obediently submitted to that we have come perilously near to a dictatorship. The President has not contented himself by advising what measures should be considered by Congress and

vetoing them if they do not meet his approval, as the Constitution authorizes him to do. He has demanded that certain legislation shall be enacted, has insisted upon Congress remaining in session until the laws he insists upon are enacted, and the secret caucus is made the instrument with which to enforce his will. As a consequence we have laws on the statute books that are in effect, and in reality, Executive orders and not legislative acts. They are legislation of and enacted by the executive department and not by Congress. It is a condition that should attract the serious attention of the whole country. We have three distinct departments of government. They were intended by the framers of the Constitution to be independent of each other. It has, up to a very late period, been regarded as absolutely necessary to the liberty of the people and the public welfare that this independence should be maintained. A few days ago we listened to the reading in this Chamber of Washington's Farewell Address. In the course of that address he says:

It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power by dividing and distributing it into different depositories and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against the invasions of the others has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern, some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates; but let there be no change by usurpation, for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

This solemn declaration of so evident a truth that seems to have been forgotten by some should be taken to heart now as never before in the history of our country.

The Supreme Court of the United States is even more emphatic in declaring the separation of the departments of Government and their independence. In the case of *Kilbourn v. Thompson* (103 U. S., 168, 190) this is said on the subject:

It is believed to be one of the chief merits of the American system of written constitutional law that all the powers intrusted to government, whether State or National, are divided into the three grand departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. That the functions appropriate to each of these branches of government shall be vested in a separate body of public servants, and that the perfection of the system requires that the lines which separate and divide these departments shall be broadly and clearly defined. It is also essential to the successful working of this system that the persons intrusted with power in any one of these branches shall not be permitted to encroach upon the powers confided to the others, but that each shall by the law of its creation be limited to the exercise of the powers appropriate to its own department and no other. To these general propositions there are in the Constitution of the United States some important exceptions. One of these is that the President is so far made a part of the legislative power that his assent is required to the enactment of all statutes and resolutions of Congress.

This, however, is so only to a limited extent, for a bill may become a law, notwithstanding the refusal of the President to approve it, by a vote of two-thirds of each House of Congress.

So also, the Senate is made a partaker in the functions of appointing officers and making treaties, which are supposed to be properly executive, by requiring its consent to the appointment of such officers and the ratification of treaties. The Senate also exercises the judicial power of trying impeachments and the House of preferring articles of impeachment.

In the main, however, that instrument, the model on which are constructed the fundamental laws of the States, has blocked out with singular precision and in bold lines in its three primary articles the allotment of power to the executive, the legislative, and the judicial departments of the Government. It also remains true, as a general rule, that the powers confided by the Constitution to one of these departments can not be exercised by another.

It may be said that these are truisms which need no repetition here to give them force. But while the experience of almost a century has in general shown a wise and commendable forbearance in each of these branches from encroachments upon the others, it is not to be denied that such attempts have been made, and it is believed not always without success. The increase in the number of States, in their population and wealth and in the amount of power, if not in its nature to be exercised by the Federal Government, presents powerful and growing temptations to those to whom that exercise is intrusted to overstep the just boundaries of their own department, and enter upon the domain of one of the others, or to assume powers not intrusted to either of them.

But more conclusive still to the Democratic Party and its leader should be these declarations contained in its national platform:

We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

Our platform is one of principles, which we believe to be essential to our national welfare. Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign, and we invite the



cooperation of all citizens, regardless of party, who believe in maintaining unimpaired the institutions and traditions of our country.

It would seem that nothing more need be said on the subject. But, sir, there is a feeling, not without foundation, that there should be a closer relation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in the making of the laws. To this end it has from time to time been suggested that members of the President's Cabinet should be authorized by law to sit in Congress, to take part in the discussion of public questions, and be subject to inquiry on any subject that may arise. This would enable the executive department to present the views of that department to Congress, in an orderly way, in dealing with public questions, and at the same time put it in the power of Congress to test the knowledge of the representatives of the Executive and the wisdom or accuracy of their views. I am not going to discuss that question. I am not prepared to say that it might not be a good thing if authorized by law. But such necessity for participation in the framing of the laws by the executive department, if it exists, can be no justification or excuse for interference with legislation by that department without authority of law. Neither can good intentions affect the question. If such efforts to control legislation are wrong, unauthorized by law, and dangerous, as I maintain they are, the sentiment that prompts them can not affect the question further than to mitigate or aggravate the offense in the individual case.

#### INDIFFERENCE AND INEFFICIENCY.

Mr. President, one of the most striking features of the work of this body at this time is the apparent apathy and lack of interest in the work before it. This is not confined to the Democratic side of the Chamber. It extends to and affects the whole Senate in the performance of its duties. But it is more pronounced and more general on the other side of the Chamber. Seats in the Chamber are vacant for days, sometimes for weeks, at a time. Senators will not listen to discussions of questions of the greatest importance and most vital to the interests of the country. The Senate seems to have lost snap and vigor and industry. Committees are poorly attended. Quorums are obtained in case of the most important committees with the greatest difficulty, and a prompt meeting of a committee at the time it is called to meet is practically unknown. Some committees having important business before them do not meet at all. The Committee on the District of Columbia, one of the large and very important committees of the Senate, having to do with the vast and important interests of the District, is one of these. There have been over a hundred bills referred to that committee this Congress, some of them very important ones, and only four of them have been reported out. The committee has had but one meeting during this session of Congress. These conditions did not exist under the last Republican administration. Committees met with regularity, and usually in the more important committees a quorum was present. One of the peculiar phases of the present situation is that while the Democrats are in the majority and have larger representation on the committees there are almost invariably more Republicans than Democrats present at committee meetings. It is evident that our friends on the other side of the Chamber do not like committee work.

Now, Mr. President, what is the cause of this condition of stagnation, lack of interest, and consequent inefficiency in the work of the Senate? It was claimed here on the floor only a short time ago, I believe by the Senator from New York [Mr. Root], that it was because our system of procedure by committees is a failure. But, sir, I do not believe that is the cause of the inefficiency that exists. It is the result rather than the cause. Work through committees fails only because that work is not well done. No better means of facilitating the work of Congress has been suggested and probably none will be found.

No, Mr. President, that is not the cause nor reason for the extreme conditions that exist at the present time. In my judgment, the reasons are not far to seek, and they are ample. The Senate is indifferent to its work. It has lost interest in it and does not show the vigor and energy of former times, mainly because it is no longer an independent body. Its bills are prepared for it by another department of the Government and are forced through by Executive order and, if need be, by the secret caucus. It is a blight upon the Senate and its work. Men of spirit and independence of character will not work energetically or with enthusiasm if compelled to work under a master. Slavish obedience to the commands of the head of the executive department will sooner or later destroy the independence and usefulness of Congress. It has come perilously near it already. This unwarranted interference of the executive department with the functions of Congress has extended to the committees of both Houses. Committees re-

ceive bills prepared by that department. They visit the White House to confer with the President about measures of legislation and are directed by him. Democratic Members hold secret caucuses to the exclusion of Republican Members and formulate and agree upon bills to be passed. Republican members of committees under such circumstances have no voice in the formulation of legislation or the reporting out of bills, and might just as well absent themselves from committee when bills are being considered in that way.

Mr. President, the passing of bills by Executive order and caucus rule affects this side of the Chamber as well as the other, but not to the same extent. The knowledge that the passage of a bill has been agreed upon with the President and decreed by a secret caucus destroys any interest that may be taken in future proceedings upon it on both sides of the Chamber. Any discussion that may be had upon it is wholly perfunctory. On the Republican side anything that is said is known to be useless, except as a protest, and on the Democratic side no discussion at all is necessary. It has been had in the secret caucus. What can be expected of Congress under such circumstances? Why should interest be taken in its proceedings, even by its own Members? If this manner of dealing with legislation continues for long, the country will lose all respect for Congress, and it will richly deserve public condemnation.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. President, one of the most important questions before Congress and the country at this time is that of woman suffrage. It is a live political issue. It is evident to everybody who understands the situation that this administration is opposed to granting suffrage to the women. But it lacks the courage to come out openly and oppose it. Efforts have been made to secure from the President some expression of his views on this important subject. A short time ago a delegation of women called upon the President to secure, if possible, his aid in their effort to so amend the Constitution as to give to their sex the right to vote. He answered their appeal by saying:

I want you, ladies, if possible, if I can make it clear to you, to realize just what my present position is. Whenever I walk abroad I realize that I am not a free man; that I am under arrest. I am so carefully and admirably guarded that I have not even the privilege of walking the streets. That is, as it were, typical of my present transference from being an individual with his mind on any and every subject to being an official of a great Government, and incidentally, or so it falls out under our system of government, the spokesman of a party.

I set myself this very strict rule when I was governor of New Jersey and have followed it as President—that I am not at liberty to urge upon Congress in messages policies which have not had the organic consideration of those for whom I am spokesman.

In other words, I have not yet presented any legislature my private views on the subject, and I never shall, because I conceive that to be part of the whole process of government, that I shall be spokesman for somebody, not myself.

I am an individual; when I am spokesman of an organic body I am a representative. For that reason, you see, I am by my own principles shut out, in the language of the street, from "starting anything." I have to confine myself to those things which have been embodied as promises to the people at an election. That is the strict rule I set for myself.

When my private opinion is asked by those who are cooperating with me I am glad to give it, but I am not at liberty until I speak for somebody besides myself to urge legislation upon Congress.

This was a most remarkable statement to make. He purposely evaded any expression of views or opinion on the subject. But this was not nearly so remarkable as his reason for not doing so. Woodrow Wilson is an American citizen, and as such has a perfect right to express his views on any public question. There is no reason why he should not. He could with perfect propriety have done so in this instance. He could with equal propriety have said that they were his own private views, and should not be regarded as an official declaration. Unfortunately the President regards himself not only as an American citizen and President of the United States but as the leader and spokesman of the Democratic Party. The two latter are entirely inconsistent with each other. No man can be such a President as this Nation is entitled to have and be at the same time the spokesman or leader of any political party. The sooner the country realizes that fact and insists that when a citizen is elevated to the exalted position of Chief Magistrate he shall from that time on be the President of the whole people and not a mere politician, the leader of and trying to do the will of a political party. One of the leading journals of the country, commenting on this subject, very justly says:

It is one of the evils of personal, public, and vigorous participation of the President in the deliberations of Congress as party leader that he at once falls from the lofty position of President of the Nation to the place of a mere party leader, and thereby invites, is sure to receive, and in this case richly deserves the personal attacks to which it is not well for any of us that a President of the United States should be exposed. It tends to Mexicanization.



The President might very well have said that he did not desire to express any opinion on the subject for himself or anyone else, or that he regarded the question of suffrage as one to be settled by the States, but it was exceedingly unfortunate that he should have sheltered himself behind the fact that the Democratic Party had not declared itself on the subject, and for that reason decline to speak on that account, for that was no reason at all. The President himself has since shown that his reason for not speaking was without force, as I shall show a little further along, by taking a position on proposed legislation in direct opposition to the platform declaration of the party of which he claims to be the leader.

#### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. President, this administration has declared itself as against free tolls through the Panama Canal for American coastwise ships. The President has again taken the field and is demanding that an act be passed repealing the clause contained in the former act granting our ships free passage through the canal. This is in direct opposition to the plank of the platform of the Democratic Party on the subject, which declares:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

This declaration was made when the present law exempting our ships from the payment of tolls was under consideration by Congress and with full and accurate knowledge of all objections that had been made to it, including the claim that it was in violation of the treaty with Great Britain. That provision in the canal bill was bitterly opposed and the question was extensively discussed and the free-tolls clause carried by a large majority. It was after the issue on the question was fully made up and with the known attitude of Democrats on the question that the Democratic Party declared itself on the subject. The fight against free tolls was made, principally, by the transcontinental railway companies and the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., and in their interest. There is no doubt that the same interests are at work now to repeal the act. They maintained a powerful lobby here in Washington when the bill was under consideration before. They will, no doubt, be represented here again when the bill to repeal that clause comes on for hearing. The people who believe in the granting of free tolls will want some good reason for this change of front on the part of the Democratic Party under the leadership of the President. If it is done to satisfy the demands of Great Britain, they will not be satisfied with this submission of legislation about our domestic affairs to the dictation of a foreign country. However, if the President is satisfied, for good and valid reasons, that this free-toll clause should be repealed, his advice that it should be done, in spite of the declaration of his party to the contrary, does him credit. In that case he is for once acting as President of the United States and not as the leader of his party. But if he shall attempt to force his views on Congress in this case, as he has in others, his course can not be justified. He may properly advise, but he has no right or authority to command or coerce action by Congress or any Member of it.

#### EXTRAVAGANCE IN APPROPRIATIONS.

The tendency toward paternalism and extravagance in the appropriation of public moneys is a marked characteristic feature of this administration. The example has been set by previous administrations, but this one has been going beyond them all. It is a tendency that should excite concern. As the Democratic Party has materially reduced the revenues of the Government by an unjust tariff law and imposed a direct tax on the people to make up the deficiency caused by low tariff duties, it might reasonably be expected to reduce the appropriations and expenditures. But this has not happened, and there is no evidence of an intention to reform conditions in this particular. The expenditures of the Government are enormous. The appropriations for carrying on the departments of the Government are necessary and should be ample for that purpose. These are being very considerably increased year by year. But it is the special appropriations that should be carefully looked after and over, or unnecessary expenditures guarded against. I can not take up the time of the Senate in any effort to determine whether the regular appropriations are unduly high or not. It would take up too much time even if I felt competent to deal with this broad subject, which I do not. But I am going to attract the attention of the Senate to some of what I call paternalistic and other special appropriations that deserve consideration. We establish the Agricultural Department. Of that I am not going to complain. The department has done much good. Some of the expenditures of it, notably for the distribution of seeds, are next to useless and wholly indefensible. This costs the Government over \$300,000 a year. A reform ad-

ministration would have done itself credit by abolishing this system. The Agricultural Department costs about \$20,000,000 a year. In addition to this, we have expended \$77,000,000 for agricultural and mechanical colleges in the States, something that should be done by the States themselves and not by the National Government. At this session we have passed an act appropriating \$20,000,000 for the next seven years for demonstration work on the farms in connection with the colleges and \$4,800,000 each year thereafter for the same purpose. A bill has passed the House appropriating \$25,000,000 a year for the improvement of roads within the States, a burden that should not be imposed on the National Government. We have a bill pending to appropriate \$50,000,000 a year for river and harbor improvements. We have passed a bill for the physical valuation of railroads. This will cost at least \$12,000,000, according to estimates. We have passed this session a bill appropriating \$700,000 for the cure of hogs of cholera, and horses of other diseases. We are spending \$20,000,000 a year for the preservation of the public health. For the reclamation of public lands \$101,000,000 have been appropriated, of which \$81,000,000 have already been expended. We have pending also a bill to appropriate \$1,000,000 for the survey of roads within the States, another of \$500,000 for the improvement of rural sanitation. We have passed a bill through both Houses of Congress appropriating \$35,000,000 to build a railroad in Alaska. The Postmaster General has proposed the purchase of telephone and telegraph lines that would cost hundreds of millions. The new regional bank system will burden the people with millions more every year. The Post Office appropriation has been increased by about \$25,000,000; the District appropriation bill as it came from the House by \$81,741.49. The appropriations for fortification has been raised in the Senate \$1,720,000. We have created the office of vice admiral of the Navy, and provided for the appointment of five such officers at a salary of \$12,000 a year when at sea and \$8,000 when on land. The larger appropriation bills have not yet passed the House. How much they will be increased, if at all, can only be predicted in the light of what has gone before. And so we go on spending more and more of the public money almost without limit or thought of the ultimate consequences. It is evidently one of the chief objects of the Democratic Party to legislate in this easy and convenient way in the interest of the farmers with the hope of restoring to the party the confidence lost by the passage of the tariff law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator for just a moment? I assume the Senator is criticizing the administration for some of these large appropriations. I should like to ask him if he himself has been opposed to the appropriation of moneys for the improvement of rivers and harbors and, say, for the construction of a railroad in Alaska? Does the Senator approve those expenditures or not?

Mr. WORKS. Some of them I do. I am not criticizing the President in respect to that. I am calling attention to the tendency of the Senate or of Congress itself. It does not matter to me whether they are Democrats or Republicans.

#### OUR RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

Mr. President, to speak of our relations with Mexico and the dealings of this administration with that distracted and unhappy country is an unpleasant task. It is a dark page in our history. Unless the American people shall have lost all virility, courage, and patriotism, it will be read, in the years to come, with sorrow and shame. For three long years American citizens have been murdered, their wives and daughters outraged, their homes pillaged, and their property destroyed, and this administration has done nothing more than enter occasional mild protests and submissive appeals, and to whom? To Huerta, whose government we had refused to recognize and who, according to our view, had no power or authority to act. To Villa, not recognized as a belligerent; not even a soldier, but a brigand and murderer of innocent people. To Carranza, a weakling dominated by Villa and equally without authority. What had we a right to expect from protests and appeals made to such as these?

Now, sir, how did we come to this unfortunate and degrading situation that reflects upon the integrity and courage of our country and the manhood of our people? Diaz, the man of iron will, who ruled over the Republic of Mexico by force and violence, was in his old age dethroned, deprived of his power, and by his own voluntary act banished from his country. Madero, who succeeded to the presidency by revolution and bloodshed, was a failure. He could not govern the Mexican people in peace. He was weak and unreliable. He failed to keep his promises to the people by which he came into power. He, too, was dethroned by a counter-revolution. Having been deprived of power by violence and sent to prison, he was finally assassinated, doubtless by Huerta, who succeeded



him, or with his knowledge and connivance. Our Government refused to recognize Huerta as President or the Government he had formed, because of the means by which he came into power. This left us with no one to negotiate or deal with, no one upon whom we could call for the protection of our citizens or their property or for redress where their rights were violated. Our ambassador to that country was withdrawn and finally removed from office, apparently without cause. So we could only act through subordinate officers or employees with people whom we had denounced as usurpers and wholly without authority. Then commenced a series of conduct of a kind wholly unknown to diplomacy and so absurd as to make us ridiculous at home and abroad. The President sent to Mexico a private citizen, not an officer, without authority of any kind, not as the representative of the Government, but the private representative of the President himself. Then commenced a series of negotiations, if they may be dignified by that name, that surpasses everything that has ever been known in history. Its utter futility was recognized by almost everybody from the beginning. It excited ridicule and derision and made us, as a Government, ridiculous. The President sent to Huerta certain propositions as a basis of settlement of the troubles in Mexico. They were as follows:

1. An immediate cessation of fighting throughout Mexico; a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed.
2. Security given for an early and free election in which all agree to take part.
3. The consent of Gen. Huerta to bind himself not to be a candidate for election as President of the Republic at this election.
4. The agreement of all parties to abide by the results of the election and cooperate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new administration.

Now, why should these propositions be made to Huerta? According to the position we had taken, he was only a private citizen of a foreign country, without any official standing or authority. The so-called constitutionalist leaders were the same. They did not pretend to have authority to bind anybody. They were, as everybody should have known, unable even to control their own followers. So the President laid down certain propositions and made certain demands on people having no power or authority to carry them out. The first was a demand for a cessation of fighting throughout Mexico and a definite armistice solemnly entered into and scrupulously observed. Did the President really think a few private citizens in Mexico could declare an armistice or stop the fighting that was going on all over Mexico? There were roving bands of so-called "soldiers," but really brigands and murderers, who were slaying people and destroying property without hindrance. They were subject to no authority of government or head of an army. No one, neither Huerta nor Carranza, had any control over them and could no more stop their fighting than could the President of the United States by his manifesto. Besides, there was no reason to suppose that there was the slightest disposition on the part of either of the contending forces to cease their warlike operations; and if any such armistice had been entered into, everybody having any knowledge of conditions in Mexico at that time must have known that it would not be scrupulously observed or observed at all. So this demand was impossible of performance, and if performed as to the call to cease fighting, it could not and would not have been observed. Therefore that demand had better never have been made. The next, that a free election be held in which all will agree to take part, was even more clearly impossible. I do not know who was meant by "all" in this proposal, but I suppose it meant all the people of Mexico. If it did, the President was calling for such an election as never was held in Mexico and probably never will be, and one that would be disastrous to the Republic, if all the people were allowed to vote. It would have been much worse than no election at all. The ignorance of the masses of the people in Mexico precludes the possibility of having a free election with desirable results. It would probably bring about the election of a bull fighter for President, and other public officials of a like kind, to plunder and devastate the country. It is inconceivable that anyone at all informed of conditions in that country could believe that any such thing were either possible or desirable.

The next demand, namely, that Huerta should bind himself not to be a candidate for President of his own country, was nothing less than preposterous. What right had the President of the United States to insist that a citizen of a foreign country should not be a candidate at a "free election in which all will agree to take part" or to say that the people of that Republic should not at such an election as he demanded and approved elect whom they pleased as their chief magistrate? Of course no self-respecting or independent man would submit to such a demand. To clinch this election without regard to its results, however disastrous they might be, it was further de-

manded that all parties, by which I suppose all the people of Mexico was meant, should abide by the result of the election and cooperate in the most loyal way in organizing and supporting the new administration chosen by this election. It must have been a public-spirited people that would allow the head of a foreign nation to dictate how they should hold an election, whom they should not elect, and that they should not contest the election of anyone chosen at the election they were commanded to hold. Every one of these propositions, except that Huerta should not be a candidate, was impossible of execution, and to make such demands was highly unreasonable and presumptuous.

Naturally Huerta refused to consider these proposals. What else could have been expected? His refusal put our Government in a most unfortunate position. It could not enforce its demands. It might go to war, but the refusal to comply with the demands could furnish no justification for declaring war, because we had no right to make them. So we had to submit tamely to the position of Huerta, hear the derision and sneers of the Mexican people and the indulgent smiles of all the nations of the world. And, sir, whatever may be said of Huerta in other respects—and I have no disposition to defend him—he did bear himself with courage, wisdom, and moderation in this whole matter. We were in the wrong. Our course was indefensible. He was wise enough to take advantage of us and put us to open shame. This episode was ineffectual to put an end to the conditions in Mexico or even to ameliorate the sufferings of the people. Civil war continued, murders increased, even greater destruction of property ensued. At last a prominent British subject was brutally murdered by Villa or by his orders. Public indignation ran high. The people were aroused, but the State Department maintained its usual degree of composure. I do not know why the murder of a citizen of Great Britain should have created more feeling than the assassination of hundreds of our own people, except that we have assumed to be the protector of the citizens and subjects of all other nations and insisted that such nations should leave this duty and responsibility to us. It therefore involves the question of our good faith toward other nations when we allow their people to be slaughtered in Mexico.

This case was one to put our good faith and our courage to the test. The poor widow asked for the body of her dead husband, buried on Mexican soil. What did our Government do to secure this right? It humbly petitioned Villa, his murderer, to allow his remains to be removed. The State Department spent days in trying to find out whether this man was shot by Villa or put to death by order of a drumhead court-martial, called not by a soldier, not by a belligerent, but by a brigand and professional murderer. What possible difference could it make whether he lost his life one way or the other? For this the sorrowing widow was left waiting for her dead. What should the Government have done in this case? Just what it should have done for one of its own citizens—sent our soldiers into Mexico and brought out the body. What right has Villa to say whether the body of the victim of his wrath and cruelty should be removed or not? What has become of our courage and manhood that we could leave it to him to settle such a question?

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the question of future dealings with Mexico. I am speaking of what has been done in the past and its consequences, not what should be done in the future. But I am convinced that that is a matter that we shall be forced to deal with in some decisive way, and that very soon. Congress is not without fault in allowing things to go on as they have without protest or action of any kind. If this feeble method of dealing with the Mexican situation has resulted in the unnecessary loss of American lives, Congress may well be regarded as accessory to the act.

Through all this troublous time I have never doubted the good faith or sincerity of purpose of either the President or the Secretary of State. I am sure their ultimate object has been to save this country from intervention in the affairs of Mexico. With that object I am in full sympathy and accord so long as it can be done with honor and consistently with the duty we owe to our citizens in that country and the obligations we are under to protect the subjects of other nations resident there. But I have not been in the least in sympathy with the methods resorted to to accomplish that object nor the failure on the part of the Government to protect our own people there.

We may be forced yet to intervene in some form in Mexico. If we do it should not be for the aggrandizement of our country, the acquisition of territory, or any other advantage to us, but in the interest of the Mexican people and others resident there, the restoration of peace and order, and the establishment of a stable government for our sister Republic.

During the delivery of Mr. Works's speech,



Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I have reached a point where I am about to take up another question. I see the time has arrived for taking up the unfinished business. I will suspend here and give notice that I will complete what I have to say immediately after the close of the morning business to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

[Mr. SMITH of Maryland reported from the Committee on Appropriations the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of committees."]

Mr. WORKS. In view of the fact that a part of what I am about to say discusses to some extent the matter presented by the unfinished business, I will ask the consent of the Senate to conclude what I have to say. It will not take very long.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say the Senator does not have to ask consent. The Senator can just proceed to complete his address. He has a perfect right to discuss the unfinished business.

Mr. WORKS. Then I will take advantage of my right.

After the conclusion of Mr. WORKS's speech,

SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I submit the report, which I send to the desk, on the credentials of Senator elect WEST from Georgia.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Chair what is before the Senate? I understood that the unfinished business was before the Senate.

Mr. KERN. I ask unanimous consent, out of order, for the consideration of the report which I have submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Indiana is a question of the highest privilege, the Chair rules.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not know what the report was that the Senator from Indiana had presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the credentials of WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, claiming a seat in the Senate from the State of Georgia, respectfully report that such credentials are proper in form, and that the said WEST is entitled to be admitted to a seat as a Senator from said State.

JOHN W. KERN, Chairman.

The undersigned members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections authorize the chairman to make a favorable report on the credentials of WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

JAMES K. VARDAMAN.

W. O. BRADLEY.

WILLIAM S. KENYON.

T. J. WALSH.

W. P. DILLINGHAM.

GEORGE SUTHERLAND.

LUKE LEA.

WILLIAM HUGHES.

WILLIAM H. THOMPSON.

L. Y. SHERMAN.

ATLEE POMERENE.

Mr. KERN. I move that the report of the committee be adopted, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the newly designated Senator from Georgia is in the Chamber, and I ask that the oath of office may now be administered to him by the President of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator appointed from the State of Georgia will please present himself at the Secretary's desk to take the oath of office.

Mr. WEST was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. SMITH of Georgia, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside so that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] may speak in answer to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that he ask unanimous consent, with the understanding that the unfinished business shall be again taken up at any time this afternoon that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] may desire.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Then, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, to be taken up immediately after the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH]? The Chair hears none; and the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside. The Senator from North Carolina.

"ONE YEAR OF DEMOCRATIC RULE."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, for something over two hours the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] has proceeded in an attack upon the present administration and its policies, with practically no interruptions. On account of my physical condition to-day and because I have promised the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], in charge of the unfinished business, that I would interfere as little as possible with the consideration of that measure, I should prefer, unless it be to correct some misstatement of fact that I may fall into, that I should not be interrupted, as it will require considerable time to present to the Senate the answer which I shall make to the speech of the Senator from California and also some substantive matter that I desire to present to the Senate and to the country. Interruption would not only divert me from the line of my argument, but would extend this discussion far beyond the time I have permission, through the courtesy of the Senator from Arizona, to displace the unfinished business.

Mr. President, I was greatly surprised at the character of the speech of the Senator from California. I was aware of the fact that in the late presidential campaign that Senator had cast his vote for Mr. Wilson for President. I knew that he had always since he has been a Member of this body held himself out as a Progressive and as a tariff reformer. Having understood the Senator from California as strongly favoring tariff reductions, I had supposed that he had supported Mr. Wilson largely because of his position upon the tariff, largely because he did not sympathize with the position of the Republican candidate upon that subject or those of the Progressive candidate.

The Senator from California now tells us that the reduction of tariff duties and the free listing of foreign importations do not tend to reduce prices and are not in the interest of the consumer of products. He tells us that the effect of the somewhat radical reductions made in the present tariff law has not been to bring about a reduction in prices, but, on the contrary, that it has tended to increase prices. In the light of these facts I can not understand the Senator from California's former attitude in favor of reducing tariff duties. If the Senator knows now that a reduction of tariff duties—a reduction so great as was made in the present law—will not affect prices and will not benefit the consumers of this country, he must have known that fact when he was advocating tariff reduction; and so I am at a loss to understand, in the light of his speech to-day, what he meant when he was such an ardent champion of a reduction of tariff duties in the interest of the consumer.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I must express, because I feel it, my very great astonishment at the columbiaid which the Senator from California, in view of the fact that he supported him, has leveled at the President of the United States, that great man who now occupies the Executive office, equal in intellectual endowment and admittedly, I am sure I may safely say, equal in his grasp of great public questions, equal in equipment for the duties of his great office, equal in moral force, and equal in patriotic purposes and aspirations and fidelity to the public weal to any man who has ever occupied the office of Chief Magistrate of this country. I say I have been surprised at the Senator's assault upon the President in view of the fact that the Senator gave him his ardent support, as I understand; but I have been still more surprised, if possible, that this man, this great and distinguished Senator of a great State, speaking in this august presence and to the country, in the face and in the light of his past record on the subject of tariff reduction in the interest of the people, in the light of his denunciation of the protective and prohibitive duties of the old Republican tariff—I am amazed to find him in so short a period of time, by implication at least, aligning himself upon this question with the reactionary element of his party.

The Senator seeks to belittle the achievements of the present administration—both that of administration and that of legislation. The Senator declares that during the incumbency of Mr. Wilson there have been passed and approved by him 63 acts—I think that was the number he gave—and all of these, he declares, with the exception of the appropriation bills, the currency bill, and the tariff bill, are of comparative unimportance; and as to the tariff and the currency measures he de-

clares those at best harmful and vicious in their effect upon the welfare of the country.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any considerable number of people in this country, without regard to party, who agree with the Senator from California in this indictment of the first year of Democratic administration. If there is one thing that, to my mind, the sentiment of the country has crystallized upon, it is in the conclusion that during no year of our history and under no administration has so much that makes for the peace, the happiness, the welfare, the greatness, and the glory of our common country and people been accomplished as during the last year, under Democratic administration. That feeling is shared not only by Democrats, but by Republicans who have open minds and appreciate great public service and great national accomplishment. The administration and the Congress may safely submit the indictment of the Senator from California to the calm, deliberate judgment of the American people, who, in my opinion, have already passed upon that subject and have declared the present occupant of the White House to be one of the most remarkable men this country has ever produced and that his achievements during his first year of service are unsurpassed in the annals of our history.

The Senator from California is so eager to find fault with the present administration that he devotes large space in his prepared speech to the charge that the time of the people was wasted, frittered away, during the extra session of Congress, and that the Democratic Party should be held responsible for that. I admit, Mr. President, that we did not pass during that session many measures of any great importance outside of appropriation bills and the currency and the tariff measures. That session was called for the express purpose of dealing with two great vital questions, whose far-reaching consequences affected the highest interest of every American citizen. It was called in response to a public demand, which could not be gainsaid or resisted, because the evils which had grown up with respect to those great subjects under the dominant party during its control of more than a third of a century were of such pressing importance and demanded such urgent remedy it was felt there should be no delay in dealing with them in a broadly remedial way. That was the inspiration and purpose of the special session. When that special session met, it was the distinctive purpose, by the consensus of opinion and agreement, I might say, of both sides of this Chamber, that nothing should be taken up of general importance except those two measures.

The Senator complains of the long hearings and consideration given to both of these measures by the Congress. Mr. President, I want to say in reply to that criticism—I have not heard it made before—that in the beginning of the consideration of these two measures, especially of the tariff, the other side of the Chamber demanded, from day to day, that before action was taken by the committee there should be the most thorough and exhaustive investigation; that the men who were best able to speak with reference to the tariff and the men who were best able to speak with reference to the financial situation should be invited to come here, should even be brought here, and permitted to appear before these two great committees and take such time as they saw fit in the discussion of these questions. The greater part of the time consumed in the consideration of those measures by the committee was devoted to an earnest and patriotic effort on the part of the committee to obtain light in order that they might frame measures which would meet the needs and demands of the country and afford relief against the admitted evils of the old system. It ill becomes those who then insisted upon that course now to make it a cause of complaint against the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, the Senator from California enumerated the different legislative enactments of the present administration; I believe he did not read them, but asked that they be published as a part of his remarks. I do not know what that summary contains, but I want to put alongside of that summary and alongside of the comments that are made, as I assume, in that summary as to the importance or the wisdom of those enactments, a statement, not prepared by myself—I have not taken the trouble to do that—but, fortunately, I have been able to get this morning a summary, with appropriate comments, explanatory of the effect, significance, and importance of each of the larger measures of the last year, prepared by that great Washington correspondent of the New York World, Col. Charles S. Albert. I do not think I will take the time now either to read the statement or to ask that the Secretary read it, but I will ask that it be incorporated in my remarks. I hope when the people of this country come to read the speech of the Senator from California, if they should do me the honor to read also my feeble impromptu remarks in reply to some of his statements

and representations, that they will read in parallel columns the Senator's enumerations and his comments and the enumerations and comments of this great correspondent of a great paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THORNTON in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WHAT WILSON HAS ACHIEVED IN FIRST YEAR—NO SUCH RECORD MADE BY ANY PREDECESSOR.

WASHINGTON, February 23.

For the first time in 50 years the hand of Wall Street has been removed from the Government of the United States.

This desirable result is regarded by President Wilson as the paramount achievement of his administration. He considers the elimination of Wall Street as a dominating factor in many governmental functions the best gift of triumphant Democracy to the American people. The removal of this blighting influence will prove beneficial, if not permanent.

Aside from this accomplished blessing, the President views the creation of a new banking and currency system as the most notable event of his incumbency. He believes this great reform takes precedence over downward revision of the tariff, with the partial destruction of special privilege and the transfer of taxation from poverty to wealth.

One year of Woodrow Wilson's service as President of the United States and leader of the Democratic Party has become history. One-fourth of his elective period has expired. In taking stock no Chief Executive has ever found such a remarkable record of performance to his credit. With persistence and wisdom he has steadfastly urged redemption of all pledges carried in the Baltimore platform. He has been supported by both branches of Congress to a more marked degree than any predecessor in office.

#### GREAT ACHIEVEMENTS.

Among the great achievements which President Wilson has guided to consummation are:

A banking and currency law which has removed the hand of Wall Street and established a democracy of credit.

A tariff act comprising reduction in duties on imported necessities and calculated to lower the cost of living. No favoritism has been shown protected interests, but the people were substituted as beneficiaries. In framing this legislation the supervision of Wall Street and special interests was rejected.

The lobby, representing all those who profited from legislation, through publicity on the part of Mr. Wilson, was removed as a powerful instrumentality in the shaping of statutes. As a result of exposures made by the President, this obnoxious feature of congressional intimidation was removed.

Two important amendments to the Constitution—the first adopted in 43 years—were made effective. One provides for the direct election of Senators by the people. The other authorizes the imposition of a tax on incomes, thus transferring the burden of maintaining the Government from the poor to the wealthy.

Proposals were made to all civilized nations for the arrangement of treaties whereby actual hostilities would be deferred during a year of reflection. Thirty Governments signified their acceptance of this principle.

#### RETURN TO POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

A return to popular government was encouraged when the President appeared in person and addressed the two branches of Congress on legislative propositions. He thus sought to terminate domination through private arrangements and secret conferences by the aid of public opinion.

The amendment of laws whereby arbitration of disputes between capital and labor was made more successful.

The constitution of peace presented by the President has gone far in the direction of breaking up interlocking directorates, which formed the backbone of trusts and monopolies.

The helping hand of the Government was extended to the farmers when \$50,000,000 were distributed to assist in moving crops.

The divorcement of the Government from the New York financial concerns that proposed cooperation with foreign Governments in furnishing funds for China.

The employment of peaceable methods by which the Telephone Trust was dissolved without litigation or expense.

The policy of diplomatic postponement under which the unsettled relations between the United States and Mexico have been handled.

The placing of the Postal System on a self-sustaining basis for the first time in governmental history.

The Parcel Post System has been developed and extended to a remarkable degree of efficiency and benefit.

#### MAJORITY RULE IN CONGRESS.

Parliamentary rules in the Senate and House were amended, removing the heritage received from Aldrich and Cannon, leaving the majority to control.

The pure-food act was extended to include inspection of all meats, thus affording adequate protection to American consumers.

A bureau of markets was established in the Department of Agriculture, providing a scientific method by which farm products may be transported and distributed.

The Armor Plate Trust was compelled to submit competitive bids in connection with the construction of American battleships. The Government was saved more than \$2,000,000.

The special delivery system was extended to the parcel post.

The home life of the farmer was given consideration by the Department of Agriculture. Encouragement in the utilization of labor-saving devices was contained in 55,000 letters sent out.

The full protection of the law has been given Indian children.

A new public-land policy was inaugurated. It combines conservation and the proper use of the national domain.

The enactment of an agricultural extension law, which is expected to double the production of American farms.

The institution in the Navy of academic, vocational, and technical instruction.

The two great transportation monopolies of the East and West were forced to dissolve. The Pennsylvania Railroad relinquished its holdings in the Baltimore & Ohio. The Southern and Union Pacific merger was canceled.

The extinction of many great combinations in restraint of trade by agreement.



The ratification of eight general arbitration treaties, which will enable the President to adjust numerous foreign disputes and complications that now prove irritating. Among the treaties approved were those between the United States and Great Britain and with Japan.

The establishment of an eight-hour day for women and girls in the District of Columbia.

#### TO REDEEM PLATFORM PROMISES.

Marvelous as has been the record of performance, it represents less than 50 per cent of President Wilson's plans for redeeming platform promises and perpetuating prosperity for the people. In addition to the achievements indicated, he has planned and started on the road to legislative completion more beneficial propositions than any predecessor. Many of these will soon be on the statute books. All the remaining features of his program will be enacted into law before another anniversary of presidential incumbency is reached.

The list of important matters under way includes:  
The negotiation and ratification of a treaty with Colombia by which payment shall be made for the loss of Panama and the Canal Zone. This is considered on a parity with the great achievements of the past year. It is intended to remove the stain upon national honor caused by the violent seizure of Panama and restore friendly relations with a sister Republic.

The repeal of the tolls-exemption clause in the Adamson Act, under which American coastwise vessels are given free use of the Panama Canal. This is expected to remove causes for irritation between this Government and those of Great Britain and other maritime powers. It will demonstrate that the United States is willing to respect all treaty obligations.

The ratification by the Senate of 16 additional general arbitration treaties.

The continued arrangement of peace treaties until all civilized nations have been brought into a "breathing" agreement with this country.

Continued efforts for the restoration of peace in Mexico without intervention or the employment of force.

Perfection of a treaty with Nicaragua under which this Government will acquire the right to construct a canal over the Nicaraguan route and secure sites for a naval base and fortifications to protect the Panama waterway.

Legislation under which the Federal Government and the various States will unite in the construction of good roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, much of the speech of the Senator from California covers things that have been thoroughly thrashed out upon the floor of the Senate during the long months of debate upon the questions to which they refer. In my judgment, it is not necessary that they should be discussed again in the Senate. I was somewhat surprised that the Senator from California, in his eagerness to put the present administration, whose head he voted for, in the wrong, should have raked and scraped everything that could be tortured into a subject of criticism, should have revamped all of the adverse arguments that were made during the months of consideration of these measures, and should turn them against him and his administration. They do not need to be discussed now, for, as I have already said, most of the subjects upon which he has spoken have already been discussed. They will be discussed again, in the coming election, before the great body of the American people; and I have not a doubt as to what will be the verdict.

In the discussion of the subjects the Senator has covered, I shall limit myself to those things which affect legislation already passed and which pertain to the effect of that legislation upon the welfare of the country. I shall not follow him in the domain of speculation. I shall not seek to vie with him in denunciation. Nor shall I discuss anything unless it pertains to some legislation, or the effect of some legislation or some act of this administration, which is already accomplished and gone into effect.

Mr. President, I assert and shall maintain that what the Democratic Party has done in the way of legislation and administration has, in the main, been well done; that it was in the interest of the people; and that they are daily reaping the benefits; and that as time goes by they will realize them in increasing measure.

The Senator from California was pleased to denounce the caucus as inimical to popular government, and especially to denounce the caucuses held by the Democratic Party over the tariff and over the currency bills as defeating the will of the people with regard to legislation on these subjects. That charge has been repeatedly made and answered before. In reply to these insinuations and charges we have always said, as we say now, that we were charged as a party with the duty of fulfilling our pledges under our system of party government and party responsibility; and that we were responsible for legislation to carry out these pledges of our party and meet the demands of the people upon these vital questions. We adopted the caucus or the conference as a method of accomplishing our purposes, and we submit the result of our action in this behalf to the people of the country with confidence in the verdict.

It is supposed, however, that caucuses are unpopular, and so our action is and has been virulently attacked and animadverted upon. Mr. President, there was a time when the caucus almost always tended to defeat the will of the people, and whatever defeats the will of the people is going to be unpopular with the

people; but that was before representative government was restored in this country.

That was when government in this country was government by Wall Street and by special interest. That was when the people had practically no voice in the making of the laws and in the conduct of their business at Washington and in many of the State legislatures. That was during the dominion in this country of the trust and the monopoly and the special interest.

Thank God, that day has passed. The greatest achievement of Woodrow Wilson rests in the fact, recognized by the people, that he has restored representative government in this country; that he has taken the Government out of the hands of these special interests and lodged it once more in the hands of the people, and that the people rule not only at the ballot box but in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me. There will be ample time for the Senator to reply to me when I have finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the caucus, acting upon the tariff, brought about this result: It brought about harmony among the Democrats in this body. It brought the Democrats of this body together upon the basis of compromise. It secured a Democratic bill that carried out the pledges of the party to the people, that carried out the will of the people upon this great question; and we were enabled to pass, for the benefit of the people, a Democratic tariff instead of a mongrel Democratic and Republican tariff.

You tell me, when a caucus accomplishes this great result, when a caucus carries out the will of the people, that it will be unpopular with the people. Let us try that. I say to our opponents, you can, if you put that question to the test at the next election. I do not fear the verdict.

The Senator attacks the civil-service record of the present administration in most violent and uncompromising terms. He can see nothing but a purpose on the part of the administration to overturn all the legislation, all of the administration, with reference to the civil service and go back to the spoils system.

Mr. President, it is well known in this country that during the long years of Republican incumbency, by Executive order or by device and manipulation, in many lines of Government employment and service, nearly the whole body of Democrats were displaced, and Republicans, protected by the civil service, took their positions. It has been stated upon the floor of the Senate that in some of the great departments of the Government in this city only a handful of Democrats were holding office when Mr. Wilson came in.

How did that happen? How did that come about? If Democrats have been permitted, under the civil-service law, to stand these civil-service examinations, does anybody believe that Democrats, as a rule, have been so dull, so lacking in aptitude for the duties of those offices that they were unable to pass the examination, and were excluded because they could not qualify themselves?

I think the consensus of opinion in this country is that a Democrat is just about as capable of standing these examinations and filling these offices as a Republican; and yet that was the result. When we came in, in some way, by some process of legerdemain, the Democrats were practically out of civil-service positions in many lines of governmental employment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would rather not yield.

Mr. REED. I remember the Senator's suggestion now, and while what I wanted to say was apropos of what he has been stating, I will not interrupt him.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would rather not yield. I wish to get through as soon as possible.

More than that, it is a matter of record and of common knowledge in this country that just before the retirement of the late President Taft, within less than a month of the election, I believe, when everybody in this country knew that Mr. Taft would not be reelected, and when the sentiment of the country had crystallized in the confident belief that Mr. Wilson would be elected, President Taft made an order covering something like 40,000 fourth-class postmasters, nine-tenths of whom were Republicans, under the civil service, without requiring them to stand any merit test and with full knowledge that they were Republicans.

Mr. President, if there be a position in the public service where the civil service should not apply, it is to the office of the fourth-class postmaster. Any man who has lived in the country



districts of this Nation, among the farmers, near the crossroads and the little villages where these fourth-class postmasters are, any man who has any knowledge of the duties of the fourth-class postmasters knows that what is required in the discharge of those duties is not book learning. The blanketing under the civil service of these 40,000 men, who were Republicans, just before the election by President Taft to keep Democrats out is to be left unrebuked by the Senator from California; while President Wilson, because he has consented to taking out of the civil service some five or six hundred employees, who ought to be under the civil service no more than fourth-class postmasters ought to be, is to be condemned as a spoilsman!

I have some familiarity with the duties of most of the officials taken out of the civil service by the amendments referred to by the Senator from California. For deputy marshals, for deputy collectors, and such officers, men who capture criminals and break up illicit distilleries, intelligence is needed, judgment is needed, discretion is requisite, courage is needed, but not book learning. It is not essential.

Taft is acquitted when he blankets under the civil service 40,000 postmasters who ought not to be under the civil service because of the character of their duties and necessary qualifications; and Wilson is denounced because he has taken from under the civil service five or six hundred people who ought not to be under the civil service, because the civil-service examinations afford no test of their practical efficiency.

Very much to my amazement, the Senator finds great fault with the income tax. He says we have reduced the tariff, decreased the revenues of the Government, and because of that fact we are compelled to resort to this unpopular and odious method of direct taxation. The words "unpopular" and "odious" are mine; but the Senator animadverts on the undesirability of direct taxation. Even in the case of big incomes, as against swollen fortunes, he queries whether it is wise and good policy and right; but as against any others, as to any other incomes, upon anybody except the big and rich, he says that it is a violation of all our traditional policy of opposition to direct taxation.

The Republican tariff system, unaided by the income tax, placed about as high a tax upon the poor man, his wife, his children, and his little cottage as it placed upon the rich man, with his thousands and his hundreds of thousands, and his palatial home. That condition of things, perpetuated by the Republican Party for 40 years, resulted in collecting practically all taxes for the support of the Government from consumption; it levied a tax against the individual and his needs and his necessities, while the rich, who paid but little tax, received, in the protection of their swollen fortunes and their broad possessions, the benefit of possibly more than half of all the money extracted from the people by this process of unjust taxation.

Finally that condition of things, that situation, palled upon the American people, and the public conscience, aroused beyond the point of further endurance of this wrong and this iniquity, passed an income-tax bill. The Supreme Court by a single vote declared it unconstitutional. The agitation became so fierce and so insistent and so irresistible from one end of the country to the other on the part of the masses, practically of both parties, that the States of this Union amended the Constitution, and Congress, in conformity with the will of the people, passed the present act.

Mr. President, if that constitutional amendment was not intended to place a part of the burden of government upon the men of ample fortunes and of great wealth and simultaneously, pro tanto, to take it off the shoulders of the poor and the needy, what was it passed for? What was the purpose of it? Why should the Democratic Party be challenged when putting into operation that amendment as doing a wrong to the American people?

So far from convincing the American people that we were wrong the Senator from California will find that there is no act of this administration that will be more approved than the part of the tariff bill which levies, justly and equitably, a tax upon incomes. We did not include the poor; we did not include anybody whose income was less than \$3,000, because it was that class that most largely pays the consumption taxes that we wanted to supplement.

In imposing this income tax we expected that it would make up any deficit that might arise from the customs duties imposed in the bill. You can not relieve the people of the burdens of tariff taxation without reducing tariff duties. We expected that there would be a falling off of revenues on account of the reductions that we made in the interest of the people. We intended to relieve the people of these taxes by putting the rates down, so that there might be importations, so that importations should be possible. We abhorred the Republican

thought and idea that rates should be allowed to be so high as to exclude all possibility of importations. We deliberately put some things on the free list to relieve the masses and help the manufacturer to reduce his cost of production in the interest of lower prices. We deliberately reduced duties on others to relieve the masses. In order to do that we had to put them down to a point where importations were possible, and we did it.

Mr. President, if there is any part of the speech of the Senator from California in his discussion of policies and legislation that has amazed me more than another it is his remarks with reference to the banking and currency bill. He charges that the present banking bill is a bill in the interest of the bankers and not in the interest of the people, and from that he would have it inferred that the great controlling financial forces represented in the big banks of the financial centers wanted this legislation, and the bill was framed as a surrender to their demands and their wishes, and that it was satisfactory to them.

Mr. President, the present banking and currency bill is satisfactory to the country bankers. By "the country bankers" I mean all the bankers outside of the reserve cities. It is popular with them, because they have felt the throttling grip of Wall Street. They have been made its slaves and its tools. They have been forced time and again to do things that their conscience and their judgment told them were not only against the interest of the community in which they transacted business, but against the best interests of the country; but they were helpless. They accept this bill as an emancipation from those shackles and from that slavery. They are for it, and uproariously for it, as the great Secretary of the Treasury said when he returned from that wonderful tour, circling the country, which brought him in contact and conference with all the bankers in every section of the country. They were in favor of it. They recognized that it was a great thing for them to be free. It was a great thing to the people of this country and every community of this country to have some place where in stress and need they could take their securities and get money, and there was no reason why they should not have it. It was a great relief from the old system where their masters in a few centers said "yes" or "no" to their pleading, to their cries for help to relieve distress in their communities; and whenever it suited their policy to make money high or to make money cheap, made it so.

But, Mr. President, the opposition came from the men who under the old system absolutely dominated and controlled the finances of this country, and through the finances of the country controlled its business interests for weal or woe. They to a man stood solidly against it. Why should they not have done so? The power that they wielded under the old system was a power that no emperor, king, or potentate in this world ever wielded, the power to decide the welfare and the happiness and the prosperity of the Nation as their selfish interests might dictate, the power by the manipulation of finances to garner even from the poor and the needy as well as the rich and the well to do the coin of the realm. It was not so much the love of money with them as it was the power that the possession and control of money gave them. When they lost that power their loss was equal to that of any monarch who has been forced by circumstances to lay down his scepter and dominion and control.

Yes, Mr. President, the people are amply protected. The Senator from California is mistaken, for they are amply protected. The reserve board is given effective control. It appoints three of the directors and has the power of removal at will of three others. While these three are elected by the bankers, they must be representatives of some one of the great industries of the country, and they can not be stockholders or directors in the banks. These six directors can be controlled or removed. That is ample governmental control.

What grows out of that control, of as great importance as the power to appoint three of these directors, is the power to remove three of them, for in that way practically control is obtained of a majority of the board. Under that law this board, representing the sovereignty of the Government, representing the interests of the great American people, have the right to dictate to the regional banks, every one of them, Morgan's and Rockefeller's included, what interest they shall charge the people of this country.

Do you say that it is no protection to the people of this country to have that power vested in the Government and taken out of the hands of these pirates who have exploited and preyed upon the right to fix the interest charge, to say whether money shall be high or whether it shall be low, to fix that charge according to the necessities and conditions of the different sections or regions?



The Senator from California says people have no interest or control in these banks.

Oh, yes, the people have an interest in these banks. Because the national banks and the State banks are the only stockholders under the system does not imply that the people have no interest in them. Who are the directors of the regional banks? The six who are not appointed by the United States. By whom are they appointed? They are appointed by the member banks of that region. Who owns the stock and elects the directors of those member banks? Who controls the directorate, controls the stock, dominates the policy of these member banks? Why, of course, the thousands upon thousands and tens of thousands of stockholders in those banks, located in every little hamlet and town and city throughout the length and breadth of this great country. If the people who elect the directors are the stockholders of the member banks, then the people have a voice, and not an indirect voice either, but in its influence and in its effect they have a direct voice in the selection of the six directors.

Under the present system, under the new law, every regional bank in this country will be controlled by all the banks of that region, and all the banks of all the regions will be controlled by all the banks in the system. So we have a financial system in which all the banks in all the country which have seen fit to go into the system, and practically all the national banks have gone into it, will control the financial policy of the regional banks. Under the old system the financial policy of all the banks throughout all the country was controlled by a few great banks in the great reserve cities like St. Louis, Chicago, San Francisco, New York, and Boston. That is the difference.

Mr. President, the Senator from California discusses the tariff. The Senator finds great fault with it, upon the ground that it is not a protective tariff. He says it was openly avowed upon the floor of the Senate and House at the time of its consideration that it ignored the protective principle, and for that reason he finds fault with it. It is not, of course, a protective measure. It was not intended to be a protective measure. It was intended to be a revenue measure. The duties were intended to be based upon the principle of fair and reasonable competition as the most just and equitable basis and the one which promised the most revenue to the Government. Let us dismiss the idea that it was intended to be anything that it is not.

But the Senator gravely says this measure has turned over our domestic markets to the foreigner; not that it is going to do it or that in the course of time it will work out that result, but, as I understood the Senator from California, he claims that after four months' operation under the tariff law its effect has been to turn over the industries of this country to the foreigner.

Mr. President, I am utterly amazed at that statement of the Senator in the face of well-known facts. In the face of the common knowledge of all the people of this country, I am amazed the Senator should stand here and say that that has been the effect of the tariff law.

I suppose the Senator was led into this exaggeration of statement and, probably, led into overlooking the patent facts of the situation, by his indignation because the law does not grant to certain products of his State—lemons and raisins, for illustration—a continued prohibitive duty. What the Senator would like to have, what the Senator indicates as his judgment as to what he ought to have, is a tariff rate for lemons and raisins which would force every man, woman, and child throughout this broad country who want lemons or raisins, without reference to how far he lives from the groves and the orchards and the vineyards, to buy only from California. The Senator complains because the Democratic Party refuses to stand for that; because the Democratic Party refuses to say, for the sake of making the lemon industry of California a monopoly, we will require the people of the Atlantic seaboard, 3,000 miles away, to pay the high freight transportation from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast upon lemons, when they might get them elsewhere at more reasonable rates. What is the use of passing a tariff law to relieve people if you are going to get your duties so high that there can be no competition in a product 3,000 miles from where it is raised in this country? It is transportation protection added to production protection.

There have been increased importations of these articles I have no doubt. I am glad to hear that there have been. The old duties were prohibitive. The people upon the Atlantic coast are entitled to import them. There is nothing in justice or common sense that requires that they should be forced to buy from California and pay 3,000 miles' freight charges upon products if they can get them cheaper elsewhere.

The Senator from California says that we have opened the door to the importations of meat and cattle, and that they have been coming here in much larger quantities than heretofore. Undoubtedly that is true. It was our purpose to make that possible in order to control the high cost of living in this country, in the hope that we might break the monopoly in this country. If that monopoly is extended so as to include Canada and Argentina and Australia, so that our tariff can not accomplish any good because of the monopoly extending over the foreign field of supply, as well as the domestic field of supply, then the judicial arm of the Government, the mandates of the courts, together with such additional legislation as the Democratic Party proposes as a part of its great program of reform and relief to the people, will, I hope, relieve that situation.

Mr. President, the Senator says we have also had an increase in our importations of wheat. Yes, a little; almost too little to mention. As far as cattle are concerned, there is not much difference in the cost of raising cattle here and in Canada. So far as wheat is concerned, there is not much difference in raising wheat here and in Canada. We all heard time and again when we were discussing the tariff here the evidence which showed that Canadian wages and American wages are pretty much the same. There has been some importation of wheat. There has been some of cattle. There has been some importation of other things. But, Mr. President, when the Senator goes to calculating the per cent of the increase of these imports I call his attention to the fact that by reason of the prohibitive duties upon wheat and upon cattle there was relatively no importation of those products and others that he mentions into this country before the present tariff law was passed. If there has been any importations worthy of mention of either one since the tariff law was passed, of course starting with practically nothing it does not take much to make a big per cent of increase.

I made some little calculation, rough, probably not altogether correct, with reference to the amount of meat that has been imported into this country for three months—October, November, December, 1913—after the tariff act went into effect. I have found that taking the figures given by the bureau in regard to the increase in importations during these three months of the tariff law there have been imported of meat into this country just about 1½ pounds apiece for every man, woman, and child, or about half a pound of meat per month apiece.

The amount of wheat imported has been so negligible that it need not be mentioned. We heard the outcry of the Senator with reference to the importation of lemons and raisins. The amount of importations has been relatively negligible.

Yet, Mr. President, in face of the fact that there has been practically only half a pound of meat per month per capita imported under this tariff law, in spite of the fact that the amount of importation of wheat has been negligible, in spite of the fact that the amount of importation of products that he enumerates as those of his State have been insignificant compared with the general output of those products in this country, the Senator gravely tells us that the effect of the tariff law has been to seriously injure the cattle-raising industry, the lemon industry, the wheat industry, and so forth. Yet in the very next breath after he has made that statement, after he has charged that the effect of the tariff measure has been to seriously injure these industries in three months through the invasion of our markets by foreign goods, he states that there has been no fall in the price of these commodities; that, on the other hand, during the very period when this foreign invasion was imminently destroying the domestic industry prices were increasing in this country.

Mr. President, as long as prices increase, or as long as prices are maintained, that is conclusive evidence, accepted by every school of economy in the world and by every man of common sense in the world, that there is not any influence at work undermining, disturbing, not to say destroying the industries concerned.

Oh, our friends have failed to look at the record facts. What are the record facts of importations into this country? Taking everything during the last six months of 1912, when the Payne-Aldrich Act was in full force and effect in this country, as compared with the six months closing January 1, 1914, when the present Democratic tariff law was in effect during four months, the records of the Department of Commerce show that during that period of time, so far from a foreign invasion of our markets, so far from importations such as we had expected to come in the course of time, the importations have been slow in coming. National business especially has always slowly adjusted itself to changed conditions. During that period in 1913, when the Democratic tariff law was in effect for four months, the imports into this country were, in round figures, \$20,000,000

less than they were during the corresponding six months of 1912. But during those six months, showing our ability to compete not only upon our own soil but throughout the world under the present tariff law, our exportations have increased about \$19,000,000; and during the last six months of the year 1913, when this Democratic tariff law had been in operation for three months, there was an increase in our foreign trade balance of \$38,000,000 over the trade balance for the like period of the previous year.

Mr. President, those are the facts. Our imports up to this very hour have not been as great as they were during the seven months of 1912, including January of 1913. During this very time, during the three months when the tariff law has been in operation—this law that it was said would paralyze industries, this law that it was said would result in the invasion of our market by the foreigner, this law that it was said would so completely destroy the competing powers of our home industries that they would not be able to hold or maintain the trade we now have in foreign countries—during the last six months of 1913, Mr. President, four months of this time under this Democratic tariff, our exports have exceeded our imports something over \$400,000,000. To the foreigner—this man whom we so much fear here at home, this man whom we can not compete with—we are to-day selling, under this tariff, in four months, over \$400,000,000 more goods than we are buying from him.

Mr. President, the Senator talks about increases in prices. There have been increases in some prices, I expect. There have been decreases in some prices, too. The truth about the business, Mr. President, as everybody knows, is that up to the present time the importations have not been sufficiently large to materially affect the price of products. These importations will grow; they will increase; certainly until there is a reduction in prices just exactly as we predicted. We did not predict an immediate tumble in prices. We said it would be slow, it would be gradual, almost imperceptible at first, but that it would come. You can not reduce prices through the tariff until there are sufficient importations to potentially affect the supply of the country. Take any of the products that the Senator from California has been talking about, the price of which he says has not been decreased. Although there have been increased importations, you will find that the importations have been so negligible that no man of common sense will expect them to very materially affect the prices.

The Senator has indicated that the price of meat has been increasing in this country. I think his statement was entirely misleading. He said that there had been so much increase, first, from 1900, and, finally, he said there had been an increase in the price from the beginning of 1913 up to the present time. Mr. President, you can see the fallacy of that statement. There may have been no increase at all during the last three months, when the new tariff law was in operation. There may have been a reduction during the last three months, when the new tariff law was in operation, but the increase from the beginning of January, 1913, under the operation of the old system, up to the time the new tariff law went into effect might account for an increase for the entire period, notwithstanding a reduction during the last three months.

I know that there is not that clamor to-day about the high price of meat that there was; I know that there is not that clamor in this country about the high price of eggs that there was; and yet the Senator from California would have us believe that eggs have not fallen in value, even out there in his own community, in his own State, to which, it is said, that China is exporting eggs—eggs unfit for human food, laid by the hens, as it is said in the letter which the Senator read, or produced, to use a politer expression, under conditions in China which render them unfit for use; and yet the Senator would gravely have the country believe that these spoiled, these insanitary, these unfit eggs from China are finding such a ready market on the Pacific coast that they are actually destroying the market for the fine, white, high-quality eggs of the California hen.

The Senator's contention goes a little further than that. We have not only, he says, destroyed the American market, turned it over to the foreigner, but he said, if I caught his words correctly, and I think I did, this measure that we have passed, this great wickedness that we have done in reducing tariff duties below the protective level, ostensibly and professedly in the interest of the people, has cheapened and degraded American labor.

Mr. President, I know of no influence, save one, working in this country which has degraded American labor. I am sure the tariff is not doing it. I will tell you the only thing of foreign origin or production that is cheapening and degrading American labor. It is the importation of ignorant foreign labor induced by the men who have been clamoring for protec-

tion to their factories and to their mills, and clamoring for it on the ground that they wanted this protection in order to enable them to maintain the high American standard of wages. It is these ignorant foreigners, imported here to supply the demand of these protected industries, employed by factories deliberately, because as they do not maintain the American standard of living, they can be secured at a less wage. That is doing more than everything else in this country to cheapen and degrade American labor and add to the list of the unemployed. It is the one influence that has stood in the way of the labor organizations of this country, of the labor unions, in their efforts to improve their wages and their condition. Whatever the wage earners have got in the way of better wages in this country they have not got through these protected manufacturers, these beneficiaries of the tariff, who have sought to lower their standard of wages by importing cheap and ignorant labor. They have got it through their organizations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not interrupt me. I am trying very hard to get through. I shall be glad for the Senator, when I get through, to say what he should like to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator made the request or I should have refrained from interrupting him. There were one or two points which the Senator recently made that I should like to get a little light on.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from California says—and that has been repeated here before—that the tariff law has resulted in putting thousands of laborers out of employment; and yet I have not found a man, when the matter was discussed in the House—and this phase of the matter was debated there, and it has been debated in the press—I have not found a man who was ready to say that there has been a reduction of the wages of labor in any part of this country, in any industry in this country, during the last three months. Of course there may have been isolated cases where wages in that period of time have been decreased, as there have been like cases of increase; but, taking the level, it seems to be conceded by everybody, as I have abundant testimony here, which I shall ask to incorporate in the Record, from representatives of various interests throughout the country, that there has been no reduction of wages in the industries of this country since the passage of the tariff law. In another body one of the leading opponents of the tariff law admitted the fact that there had been no reduction in wages in the factories, and I have here, and will put them in the Record, statements from others in a position to know, to the effect that there has been no reduction in wages. I take it that it is an admitted fact, therefore, that there has been no reduction of wages in any one of the industries of this country.

I want to put this proposition, Mr. President: When there is a steady maintenance of the rate of wages—according to all theories of economics—is not that a conclusive proof that there are not two men seeking one job; that there is work for every man who wants work? You will not make the American people believe that an unusual number of men are unemployed in this country because of the reduction of tariff duties unless you can convince them that the rate of wages has fallen, because they know that the minute the supply of labor exceeds the demand there will be a reduction in wages in response to the universal law of supply and demand.

Of course, Mr. President, there have been a large number of unemployed in the great cities during the wintertime. There always are a great many more unemployed during the wintertime than at other seasons of the year; but in every season of the year in the big cities of this country, and in the big cities of every other country, there are under all conditions and any conditions a large number of unemployed people—people who do not want to work, who are unemployed, but who, though unemployed, do not come to the surface until the hard stress and necessities of winter, the pinch of cold and hunger, force them to apply for charity.

In my own State, Mr. President, I know there is a great lack of labor. I am satisfied in the industries and upon the farms of my own State that to-morrow 30,000 able-bodied men could secure employment at good wages.

Mr. President, I want to put into the Record a clipping, which I think is from the Washington Post, or it may be from the Star, of November 28. The name of the paper is not on the clipping I have. It is as follows:

SEE NO LABOR CRISIS—CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT CALLS CONDITIONS NORMAL.

New York, February 27, 1914.

The country is not facing an unusual crisis in its numbers of unemployed. This was the consensus of opinion expressed at the national conference on unemployment, which began a two days' session in New York to-day.

Many women, representing different States and foreign countries, attended the session.



Mayor Mitchel, who opened the conference, declared that this year presented almost unprecedented conditions. Three hundred thousand, he said, might be an exaggerated estimate of the number of unemployed in New York, but the number was at least the largest that had ever flooded the city.

#### PRESENT CONDITIONS NOT ABNORMAL.

Charles B. Henderson, secretary of the Chicago commission of the unemployed, took issue with Mayor Mitchel. "Present conditions," he said, "are not abnormal. Most agencies report that the number of the unemployed is not larger than usual. The tragedy of the present conditions consists in the fact that they are not abnormal, but are steadily recurring, inevitable results of industrial mismanagement throughout the country."

Mr. Henderson said the two years' work of his commission proved that most of the work in alleviating conditions of unemployment has been done by private bureaus with great economic waste and in some places with grave abuses.

#### HITS AT FREE PUBLIC BUREAUS.

"Present free public bureaus," he continued, "are almost without exception inefficient. The fact is, it is impossible to furnish men with jobs when no jobs are to be had. The solution lies in reforming industrial methods, so that full staffs of employees may be retained even in slack seasons."

"There is no problem of unemployment in my State," said W. C. Cheney, delegate from Connecticut. "In fact it is the other way around. Not long ago manufacturers were actually unable to procure the labor they needed."

Mr. President, in addition to that I wish to put into the RECORD the statement of several officers of charitable bureaus, who make it a business to look after and to care for the unemployed in the cities in which they live, and cooperatively throughout the country, to the effect that the number of unemployed people at this time is not abnormal; also, a statement of Mr. Gompers, made in a recent address, with reference to the condition of the unemployed in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission to do so will be granted.

The statements referred to are as follows:

[From New York Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 17, 1914.]

STATEMENT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF EMPLOYMENT BUREAU AS TO NUMBER OF PEOPLE OUT OF EMPLOYMENT.

J. J. Fitzgerald, head of the employment department of Gimbel Bros., said:

"Several days ago we placed a big display advertisement in the four leading New York newspapers asking for applications for positions of milliners, copyists, milliner helpers, and apprentices. We offered the highest salaries obtainable by this class of help in New York City. We expected hundreds of applications, but received only seven. The advertisement was taken out of the classified columns and placed in other parts of these four papers, in the belief that we would have better results, but they failed to bring a single answer."

"Picture fitters usually are to be had in any number. We advertised for them, and received seven applications. Two years ago, when business was unusually prosperous, according to all reports, we frequently had 8 and 10 applications from chauffeurs. If we told them that we could not take them on, they frequently asked to be employed as helpers until there was an opening. Now we have few applications, and I haven't heard a chauffeur ask for a helper's job for many months."

#### MORE HELP NEEDED.

"I was looking over our employment sheets and wondering where I was to obtain more help when the head of the mail-order department telephoned to me and said that he would need several men. Every department store in the city is confronted with the same situation with which we are faced, and I can not remember any period when there was a less number of applicants for work than at present."

"Just previous to the holidays we had hundreds of applications for work, and if there was any business depression it was to be felt then, to judge from the number of unemployed. If we had advertised at that time for sewing-machine salesmen, we would have received scores of applications, many of the persons making an effort to 'bluff' their way through. A few days ago we advertised for this same kind of help and received two applications."

#### ONE CLASS ALWAYS "OUT OF WORK."

James T. Hunt, business manager of the Bowery Mission and head of the Mission Employment Bureau, said:

"We are having a great number of applicants for work, but not a sufficient number to lead us to think that there are 350,000 men out of work in New York City alone, as has been said. Several months ago we had hundreds of applications from men who had been laid off by railroads, street car lines, telephone and telegraph companies, but they soon began to grow scarce, and I understand that most of them have again been placed at work at their trades."

"It would make no difference what state of prosperity we had, there would always be a certain element looking for work and making a howl about hard times. It is easy to discriminate between this class and that composed of able-bodied, willing, and intelligent workmen who may be thrown out of employment. We will always have both classes to deal with, irrespective of how good business conditions may be."

"During the seven years that our employment bureau has been in existence we have placed 22,000 men. At present we are receiving just as many calls for men as we received during the time when we were supposed to be enjoying an unusual run of prosperity. Manufacturing plants that were partly closed down two months ago are again working with full forces, and in many instances I have heard of extra men being placed at work to take care of increasing business."

#### GAIN IN TYPEWRITER BUSINESS.

Alfred Augustus Fraser, general manager of the New York office of the Remington Typewriter Co., at No. 327 Broadway, said that his company's business has shown a decided improvement in the last two months.

"Business is better with us in all parts of the country," said Mr. Fraser, "but in New York the improvement is more marked than elsewhere. Our sales in December greatly exceeded those for December, 1912, and since January 1 we are far ahead of our business for the cor-

responding period in 1913. Orders and contracts now in hand assure us a profitable year. We feel certain that business in general must be good and getting better, because there is no surer barometer to the condition of trade than the typewriting industry. Our employment agency also reflects the healthful tone of business. There is an increased demand to-day for stenographers, and we find that salaries are running higher than they have been for many a day. Employers are ready to pay more now for stenographers and bookkeepers than they were willing to pay at any time last year. Good operators are in demand daily, and where last year they had trouble in obtaining permanent places at relatively low wages they are finding them now at salaries that give no concern about making ends meet."

STATEMENT OF MRS. HARRIMAN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER ON UNITED STATES INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, TO THE EFFECT THAT CONDITIONS ARE ABOUT THE SAME IN LABOR MARKET NOW AS THEY ARE AT THIS SEASON EACH YEAR.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, resident commissioner of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations, to-day gave out the following statement supplementing yesterday's announcement of an investigation by the commission into unemployment:

"Anyone who fails to realize that conditions are about the same in the labor market now as they are at this season each year is either ignorant of conditions or insincere."

"The unskilled laborers, who are the chief sufferers from these annual periods of unemployment, are for the most part migratory, and belong to the class known as floating labor. This makes the problem an interstate one, which can only be adequately studied by a Federal body."

[Editorial from the New York Herald, Tuesday, Feb. 17.]

UNEMPLOYED IN NEW YORK—AN "ARMY" THAT HAS DISAPPEARED.

President Wilson is fully justified in questioning "statistics" that assume to show the presence of 350,000, or anything like that number, of unemployed in this city. The Herald certainly challenges their accuracy, and examples of Sunday and of yesterday furnish ample warrant for the challenge.

Confronted by the herculean task of clearing the city's streets of the heavy accumulation of snow, Commissioner Featherstone and the contractors working under him sent out urgent calls for men. The response was prompt on the part of those who wanted work. Every man who applied was employed, and still the need for men remained.

Were there 350,000 applicants? Were there one-half, one-tenth that number? Mr. A. F. Gunther, superintendent of the bureau of snow removal, said he had about 13,000 men working yesterday. "We could use many more if they would apply," Mr. Gunther added. Either the "vast army of the unemployed" upon which the croakers have been harping has never existed or it vanished at the first suggestion of work.

STATEMENT GIVEN THE NEW YORK HERALD BY MR. GOMPERS FEBRUARY 26, 1914.

Unfortunately there is considerable unemployment among the working people of our country—and in so far as when any one man is unemployed through no fault of his own, to him it appears that all our social fabric is a failure—but that reports of the tremendous number of unemployed are much exaggerated I have not the slightest doubt. We are in the midst of winter and are now passing through the transitory stage of reconstructive tariff and banking legislation, and my experience warrants me in saying that the number of unemployed at present is comparatively less than during similar seasons of the year when tariff legislation had previously just been enacted. I am also decidedly of the opinion that the period of unemployment will be much shorter than during former similar periods and transitory conditions. The adjustment of industry to the new conditions is of vital consideration.

#### BUSINESS CONDITIONS.

There are three facts which answer completely the charge that conditions are panicky and that there is no work for the man who wants to work.

First is the fact, admitted by the leader of the House in the discussion in that body on last Friday, not denied by anybody, that there is plenty of money to be had for investment at low rates of interest.

Second, while there has been a slight drop in prices of commodities, prices, as a rule, have been maintained.

Third, wages have been maintained. These conditions are absolutely the reverse of conditions that exist in times of panic or business stagnation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, of course the purpose of the whole argument of the Senator from California was to show that under the present Democratic tariff law there has been stagnation; that there has been depression; that there has been lack of prosperity. It is the usual, ordinary calamity howl. I want to answer that, not by argument, but by presenting a symposium of testimony coming from the press, coming from the heads and representatives of nearly all the great industries of the country from one end of the land to the other, in refutation of the charge that the conditions which exist to-day under the present tariff law are not conditions of prosperity. Before I do that, however, Mr. President, I want to offer and ask to have printed an article from a paper published in the State of Ohio, called the Medina County Gazette. It is not only an answer to the calamity howl that we have heard so much of, but it shows how industriously and systematically, and with a common purpose, these calamity howlers, these prophets of woe and of evil, have been proceeding in order to disseminate a spirit of pessimism throughout the country, to the detriment of the Democratic Party, of course, but more important, and more significant in its criminal purpose and effect, to the detriment of the business interests of the country. The article to which I have referred shows how the Republican State executive committee of the great State of Ohio had this calamity-howl argument boiler plated and sent out, presumably to every Republican paper in that State, as is charged in this article, with the request that it be published, in order that the wave of



pessimism might be started on its career of devastation and ruin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[Extract from speech by Representative ANSBERRY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

CALAMITY-CRY POLITICS SHOWN BY PLATE MATTER SENT BY OHIO REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Some time in January of this year the Republican organization in the State of Ohio sent out boiler-plate matter to the little weekly and daily Republican papers throughout the State of Ohio on this same question, containing a calamity howl. Among other papers they sent this boiler-plate matter to the Medina County Gazette, which is supposed to be a stalwart Republican paper; but the Gazette did not look at the world through the colored spectacles of the gentleman who has charge of that organization, and here is what that Republican paper said with reference to the attitude of these men:

#### "DASTARDLY POLITICS.

"There has been nothing more reprehensible in American politics than the present studied effort on the part of the standpat forces in control of the Republican Party to aid and abet an era of hard times in this country. It was openly proclaimed at the recent meeting of the Republican national committee at Washington that hard times, want, and poverty were to be the life-savers of that party. To-day from every standpat source is coming a calamity howl coldly calculated to shake business confidence and bring on industrial paralysis.

"As we write there lies on our desk a copy of the Republican News Letter, dated at Columbus, January 3, 1914. Editors are invited to use the contents of this letter in whole or in part. And what is this Republican News Letter that all the editors of Ohio are 'invited' to use and bring before their readers? It is a pure calamity howl calculated to bring on a business panic, if possible—and it is nothing else. Its one big, glaring headline reads: 'Industrial depression.' Then follow three columns of 'calamity' talk, prophesying hard times and business disaster.

"At a recent meeting of the Republican national committee at Washington, Senator REED SMOOT, national committeeman from Utah, was cheered again and again when he airily made the following declaration for a turkey-buzzard policy for his party: 'The silent wheels of the factories, the smokeless stacks of our mills, and the suffering of our people under a Democratic administration will speak louder than any national declaration of principles that we can make. All we have to do to bring victory to our banners will be to point to the closed mill doors and say: "Wilson—that's all."

"No declaration of principles needed, says SMOOT; just wait for calamity and suffering.

"From every other standpat Republican source is coming the same sort of business poison—the studied attempt to bring suffering and want to millions of American citizens to further the political ends of the Penroses and Smoots and Barneses and Daugherties now in control of the Republican Party.

"The attempt to inject this poison into the business arteries of this country is made, too, when reliable financial authorities like Bradstreet's and Dun's and Henry Clews tell us that the business outlook for 1914 is brightening daily and that there is no business depression nor panic ahead.

"The despicable political panic effort has already failed. The country is aroused against it, and the boomerang is already recoiling upon its projectors.

"The political party that seeks a new lease of life at the hands of American voters by encouraging panic and hard times badly miscalculates, for it can reap from such foul sowing only the contempt and distrust of all right-thinking people."

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the sentiment of this country with reference to the business outlook of the future is one of optimism. That optimism is justified by conditions; the people know it, and they are not going to be influenced by the cry of calamity. I do not envy, in the conditions that exist in this country to-day, the man who for political or for any other reasons under the sun seeks without justification to undermine that spirit of optimism which is such a power of hope and helpfulness to business and to prosperity in this country, especially at this time.

Now, Mr. President, I ask to put in the RECORD, without reading, various and sundry interviews which have appeared in the New York Herald, I think on the 17th, 20th, 21st, and the 22d days of the past month, the New York Journal of Commerce, and the St. Louis Republic with representatives of great institutions from various sections of the country, who testify to the same common end; that conditions of prosperity either actually exist or are indicated as about to arrive and restore normal conditions where there has been any disturbance in business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The interviews referred to are as follows:

[From the New York Herald, February 17, 1914.]

#### CHICAGO.

Charles A. Stevens, president of Charles A. Stevens & Bros., dealers in women's wear: "The prospects of spring trade are better than they have been for several years."

Modie J. Spiegel, treasurer of May, Stern Bros.: "The merchants and jobbers are making more and larger orders than they have in a long time. From the reports I have received from all parts of the country, I take it that these improved conditions are universal."

E. D. Hurlbert, president of Merchants Loan & Trust Co.: "All indications are that the improvement is sound and permanent."

#### SAGINAW, MICH.

"Industrially, Saginaw has never been in better condition than to-day, and the business prospects never looked brighter. Bankers, manufacturers, and merchants are all enthusiastic." W. S. Lenters, Republican postmaster, said: "The future never looked brighter for Saginaw than it does at the present time."

Charles W. McClure, Republican, president of one of the largest silo-manufacturing concerns in the United States, said: "Our business is 10 times as great as at any time in the history of our company, and prospects never looked brighter for all five of our plants."

W. R. Burt, one of Michigan's wealthiest citizens, is very enthusiastic over the business outlook. He said: "This prosperous condition not only prevails in Saginaw, but statements from towns throughout the St. Croix district show business throughout the section to be excellent, with the best possible prospects for the future."

#### WICHITA, KANS.

That prosperity has settled on Wichita is evinced by the amount of building that is being contracted for at present. Prospects for the largest crops in the history of the State were never better.

B. F. McLean, president of the Fourth National Bank and a prominent Republican: "Everyone is feeling fine over the outlook."

Judge E. B. Juritt, vice president of the Farmers & Bankers' Life Insurance Co., a prominent Republican, said: "Every condition points to better times. The farmers all have money."

#### WHAT THE FOLKS BACK HOME SAY.

##### DANVILLE, ILL.

Danville, home of Joseph G. Cannon, is in a rich agricultural region. The failure of some crops and curtailment of others, owing to the long drought last summer and the unseasonable weather of fall and this winter, have been felt by business men of this city and the eighteenth congressional district in general; but most of them declare that, notwithstanding these handicaps, their business for the last year has been equal to, and in many instances greater, than any year since 1907.

"There have been no business failures here; every business room is occupied, and merchants generally unite in predicting unprecedented prosperity for the next year, barring another crop failure. Real estate values are gradually increasing after several years of depression, and arrangements are being made for unusual building operations with the opening of spring.

Augustus L. Webster, Republican, president of the Webster Grocery Co., is an optimist on the future business outlook of this city and vicinity.

"Early in 1913 the prevailing conditions caused me to believe that business conditions would not improve during the last year, but my opinion was not verified," he said to-day. "The year 1913 was productive of bigger business than any year since I came to Danville, almost half a century ago. I believe every wholesale concern in Danville also enjoyed the same measure of prosperity."

"Comparing conditions existing at the present time with the conditions a year ago, I firmly believe that 1914 will be a greater season for the wholesale business in Danville than the eminently successful year of 1913. This is saying a great deal, but existing commercial and industrial conditions in Danville is the reason for my belief."

Charles L. English, Republican, president of the First National Bank, was more outspoken concerning his opinion of "Uncle Joe's" calamity talk.

"This is largely an agricultural country," said Mr. English, "and, of course, the failure of the oats crop, partial failure of the corn and other crops, was a severe blow from the principal money-producing source. Labor is now pretty generally employed, and there is a fair degree of prosperity in every branch of business. Money may be a little tight for the next six months, but I regard prospects for the coming year as being very bright."

M. S. Plant, Republican, a leading clothing merchant, said: "I regard the business outlook for the coming year as exceptionally good, barring another crop failure."

J. S. Emery, head of a large dry-goods firm; H. C. Adams, president of a building association; and Joseph Schingel, Jr., a prominent contractor, expressed practically the same views as the above. One of them stated that the general feeling of optimism for the future and congratulation over past and present conditions in the face of adverse circumstances ought to be sufficient answer to "Uncle Joe."

##### SEATTLE, WASH.

"Business conditions in the Pacific Northwest," said C. B. Yandell, secretary of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, "are 20 per cent better to-day than they were during the corresponding period a year ago. Bank clearings, customs receipts, building permits, and railroad business prove my statement. Prospects of the early recognition in the House of Alaskan needs, the opening of the Panama Canal, the recent abundant rains are sure to bring on a feeling that the entire Pacific coast country, particularly Seattle and the Northwest, is entering into an era of prosperity not known here in five years."

##### CONCORD, N. H.

Secretary James O. Lyford, of the Concord Board of Trade, who was naval officer of the port of Boston from 1898 to 1913, and who now is mentioned as a Republican candidate for the United States Senate in succession to Senator Gallinger, said to-night that there was no business depression in this city or vicinity and no indication that anything of the sort was impending.

"With one exception," he said, "every Concord industry is employing as many men to-day, at as high wages and for as many hours in the week, as was the case a year or two years ago. The one exception is the shops of the Boston & Maine Railroad, where the force employed has been diminished one-fourth owing to the opening of the road's new shops at Billerica, Mass."

"Both our wholesale and retail business houses report trade and collections up to the average for this season of the year."

##### LYNN, MASS.

After a period of depression, during which hundreds of employees were laid off, the big plant of the General Electric Co. here is getting busy again, and, according to Walter C. Fisher, its general manager, the outlook is bright. Many of the employees who were laid off have returned to work, and within a short time it is expected that every department of the plant will be in operation again. This is the between-seasons period for the shoe factories, but most of them here are busier than they have been for several months, and most of the manufacturers are confident that business will improve steadily from now on. The percentage of persons out of work in Lynn is very small compared with other years.



# SIXTEEN HUNDRED MEN RESUME WORK AT GARY STEEL MILLS. CHICAGO, ILL.

More than 1,600 men have been put back to work recently and the plant is operating about 80 per cent of capacity.

Declaring he is glad to find a factor like the Herald substantiating the position of optimism regarding business conditions he assumed more than a year ago, Henry R. Towne, president of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. and formerly president of the Merchants' Association, said yesterday that he believes business everywhere is safe, sound, and promising.

"Speaking of my own business," Mr. Towne said, "and the insight that gives to allied businesses, and my contact with business men from every part of the country, I hold, and I have steadily held for a year, the conviction that business everywhere is in a sound, safe, and promising condition."

That business conditions in this country are improving as a result of public confidence following the enactment of currency legislation was the statement made to the Herald yesterday by L. H. Shearman, vice president of W. R. Grace & Co., exporters, of No. 7 Hanover Square. Mr. Shearman said:

"It will be admitted by all business men that conditions are improving and that things will be better within a short time. The public fear that President Wilson's currency and tariff legislation might cause serious trouble if not precipitate a money panic, as was predicted by many, proved to be unfounded and a healthy reaction is now taking place. From now on I look for a steady advance in the volume of business in this country."

## OPINION OF C. A. SCHIEREN, JR.

Charles A. Schieren, jr., of the Charles A. Schieren Co., No. 34 Ferry Street, and first vice president of the American Manufacturers' Export Association, said that after a careful study of business conditions prevailing in this country the promises for great industrial activity in the coming spring are excellent. Mr. Schieren said:

"There was a decrease in the volume of business by our company in January of only 7 per cent, as compared with the figures for the same month last year. But that loss promises to be made up by a corresponding increase in the business for the current month. These facts coupled with reliable information supplied to me by correspondents in the Middle West assure me that a steady, healthful revival of business is in progress."

"Every business man felt the effect of the calamity cries which arose when the tariff and currency legislation was being discussed. The pessimists seemingly convinced the people of the country that if either of President Wilson's measures was passed a death blow to business would be dealt. But happily this prediction was not verified, the fact being that public confidence, upon which the prosperity of the Nation actually depends, has been restored."

## COTTON MILLS INCREASE OUTPUT.

Edward K. Cone, president of the New York Cotton Exchange, said that there is a strong revival of business in the industries associated with cotton. The cotton mills not only have not closed, as was predicted by pessimists, but have steadily increased their output. The consumption of cotton at the mills during January established a new high record. "All the statistics and estimates of the cotton trade," said Mr. Cone, "bear out the Herald's contention that at the base of commercial conditions all is well."

## NO HALT IN GROCERY TRADE.

Few men have a better opportunity of obtaining information regarding the general aspect of trade and business than M. E. Roche, manager of the Butler grocery stores throughout the city. Daily he meets salesmen from all parts of the country and confers with the managers of the many stores over which he has supervision. He has to make estimates and purchase accordingly. When business conditions are on the wane he is among the first to realize the fact. When they are otherwise his source of information never fails him. This is what he thinks of the outlook:

"I think the prospect never was better. Business to-day is in a splendid condition. We know by the purchases that are made daily. When there is uncertainty and lack of confidence there is a decrease in the sale of luxuries. At present there is no such thing. As far as the public is concerned, the alarmist reports of a few months ago fell on deaf ears."

"Our business year ended on November 1 last. It was a very successful one. Since then, in view of the various reports which have been circulated concerning the general business situation, I have maintained a close surveillance upon our own affairs. The result is that I am able to report that for the period between November 1 and to-day I find that we are ahead of the corresponding period of last year."

"I do not regard the situation simply from my own standpoint. In the course of my daily routine I meet and converse with men who are active in other lines. Many of these are salesmen, who come here with goods to sell and whose opportunities for gleanings authentic information are remarkably good."

"When sales are slow for them it indicates that business is slow generally. If the merchant is slow to purchase, his sales are not up to the average, and if the public is hesitant, then everything becomes more or less stagnant. But that is not the case now. Everyone seems to be ready to purchase in good quantity."

## TEXTILE TRADES PROSPER.

Thomas Smidt, a member of the dry goods firm of Victor & Achells, was another who sounded a note of optimism concerning the situation of trade.

"Our own business is in splendid condition," he said, "and the textile trade in general throughout the country is flourishing. That I know. Merchants are beginning to realize that no ill effects have been felt from the change in the tariff, and that none may be expected. This, of course, lends stimulus to trade."

"The prospects for the near future are just as bright as those of a year ago, and as far as we are concerned all departments are just as busy as they ever were. We observe also that trade all around us is in healthy condition, and we place no credence whatever in what some persons have been declaring about hard times. We have plenty of confidence. The Herald's attitude in the matter is praiseworthy indeed."

Samuel S. Campbell, vice president and director of the Fourth National Bank and director in several other concerns, stated that he observed distinct signs of improvement in the business situation generally.

"We observe a much better outlook," he remarked.

## COASTWISE SHIPPING ACTIVE.

Anton A. Raven, president of the American Bureau of Shipping, said:

"The surest barometer of business conditions I know of is the coast-

wise shipping trade. There is no better argument that I can advance to show that business generally throughout the country is prospering than to point to the increasing amount of business being handled by our coastwise vessels."

"There has been no appreciable change either for good or worse in the foreign shipping, although an increase was expected in the imports when the new tariff schedule went into effect. Our exports still lead the imports by a healthy margin, and from all indications it would be safe to say that they will show a greater gain at the end of the fiscal year than ever before in history. The shipping interests which confine their operations solely to the coastwise trade have nothing but encouraging news to give out on conditions to-day and the outlook for the future."

"With the situation cleared up in Mexico I believe there will be a great step forward in conditions in this country."

George Doubleday, president of the Ingersoll-Rand Co., said: "Business everywhere is improving, and I hear few complaints. The Ingersoll-Rand Co. is working full time again, and many of the big industrial plants are employing extra help. I hear nothing but encouraging reports. It seems to me that this talk of a business depression is absurd."

## ENGINEERING CONCERN BUSY.

S. L. Selden, of the J. G. White Corporation, of No. 43 Exchange Place, one of the foremost engineering and construction concerns of the country, said that in his opinion the country would this year enjoy one of the most prosperous years commercially and industrially known in decades. Mr. Selden said:

"There is not the shadow of a doubt in my mind but we are entering upon a highly prosperous year. This conviction is based upon a careful study of the situation and comparison with the statistical data of previous years. Last autumn we wondered if we would find work enough to keep our forces employed during the winter. That question was answered when we received so many commissions that we must work hard to keep up with them."

"If business conditions had not improved, our corporation would have been among the first to suffer. It is because of this that I say with confidence that this will be a banner year in this country. There never was anything fundamentally wrong with industrial conditions in this country, but the depression noticeable last year was almost wholly due to the groundless fear that radical changes in our financial and tariff systems would bring hard times. This fear was aggravated by senseless predictions of disappointed politicians, but in the face of it all confidence is returning, and with it the inevitable revival of business along all lines."

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 22, 1914.]

## GOOD TRADE REPORTS IN WEST AND SOUTH—MERCHANTS, BUYERS, AND TRAVELERS ALL SEE EVIDENCES OF PROSPERITY THROUGHOUT COUNTRY.

Buyers from all sections of the country, traveling salesmen, and manufacturers who were in New York yesterday were practically unanimous in the opinion that the United States is on the threshold of one of the greatest eras of prosperity in its history.

The general business conditions of the country were reflected by the fact that in most cases the buyers are increasing their orders for stocks of goods, according to the buyers and merchants whom I interviewed yesterday.

One of the large buyers who makes frequent trips to New York is George B. Monning, of the Monning Dry Goods Co., Fort Worth, Tex., who is staying at the Albert Hotel, University Place and Eleventh Street.

"The business prospects in Texas," said Mr. Monning, "are much better than at any time in the last six years. This is a conservative opinion based on a thorough knowledge of business conditions throughout the entire State."

## GOOD REPORTS FROM GEORGIA.

One of the largest manufacturers of Georgia is L. M. Lynch, who is at the Albert Hotel. Mr. Lynch's concern, the Muscogee Manufacturing Co., of Columbus, Ga., which is in the cotton-goods manufacturing business, has a New York office at No. 47 Leonard Street.

"I have traveled all through the South and the Middle West recently," said Mr. Lynch yesterday, "and I know from personal experience and observation that the country is just as prosperous as the Herald's interviews and editorials have stated."

Walter Lassiter, who is a traveling salesman for Eugene Teschner & Co., dealers in flowers and feathers, at No. 719 Broadway, said that he had just returned from a trip through the Carolinas, Maryland, and Virginia, and found a wonderful condition of prosperity throughout those sections.

"In my own State of North Carolina," he said, "everything is moving in a satisfactory manner. Merchants, farmers, bankers, and, in fact, everybody is prosperous, with the outlook bright for more prosperity during the coming year. Sales are good and everybody is happy."

## LABOR.

In discussing the matter every man interviewed said that, so far as he knew, the price of labor had not been reduced. They used this argument to refute the contention that there are unusually large numbers of unemployed men throughout the country.

"If the supply of labor is greater than the demand," they said, "and this situation exists for a great length of time, the price will fall because of the competition. We have noticed no such condition in our section."

## SOUTH ENJOYING BOOM TIMES.

"The South is not entering upon but it is enjoying the greatest era of prosperity in its history. The Civil War no longer is a date for commercial comparison. From the Shenandoah to the Gulf and from the Carolinas to Texas the reign of Midas is more nearly absolute than at any other time since the war or than it ever was in the days of slavery."

Thus spoke James L. Tapp, president, general manager, and buyer of the James L. Tapp Co., of Columbia, S. C., which for 30 years has conducted the largest wholesale and retail department store in the State. Mr. Tapp has been here a week on one of his periodical buying trips, of which he usually makes 8 or 10 a year. But he said yesterday that he found it necessary to make several times the ordinary amount of February purchases of stock and that in consequence his present stay would be prolonged nearly a month. Mr. Tapp is a director in the Palmetto National Bank, of Columbia, and is largely interested in other enterprises of that city.

"I have been in business in Columbia 28 years," said Mr. Tapp, "and I never before saw trade so good as it is to-day. Our store did the



largest and most profitable business in its history last year, and the volume of business so far this year is far ahead of 1913.

#### SEE GREATEST YEAR IN DECADE.

J. J. Selman, representing William Morris & Co., of No. 140 West Twenty-second Street, manufacturers of silk petticoats, and Lichtenstein, Reichlin & Co., of Philadelphia, manufacturers of silk dresses and waists, has just returned from a trip through the South and West. Mr. Selman said yesterday:

"I went as far South as Texas, and everywhere I found business good and the outlook even better. All through the South and West manufacturers and dealers are stocking up as if they expected 1914 to be the greatest business year in a decade. The South is too busy to pay any attention to the political pessimist."

Albert F. Rockwell, president of the New Departure Manufacturing Co., of Bristol, Conn., which employs 1,500 operatives and is running on full time, said, "That we regard business as good and expect it to be better is proved by the fact that we have just completed a large extension to our plant and are about to enlarge further by adding another building for our coaster-brake department."

C. E. Burch, of No. 45 West Thirty-fourth Street, New York buyer for Burch Bros. & Co., owners of dry goods stores in Waterloo, Marshalltown, and Mason City, Iowa, and Aberdeen, S. Dak.: "We have the largest dry goods stores in Iowa, and we can see nothing but prosperity ahead."

A. W. Burch, of Waterloo, Iowa, manager of Burch Bros. & Co.'s Waterloo store: "The West is in very good condition, and it is going from good to better. All the 100 factories in Waterloo have their entire output sold for the coming year. Prosperity prevails throughout Iowa."

#### 1914 "YEAR OF PLENTY."

J. C. Ratcliff, buyer for the Battery Dry Goods Co., of Gaffney City, S. C.: "Business is very good with us and with merchants and manufacturers of South Carolina and the South generally. In fact, we are too busy to think of any possible interruption of prosperity, and there are no indications, so far as I can see, that 1914 will not be a year of plenty and happiness."

#### THE MEN WHO KNOW BEST.

In interviews with well-known manufacturers occupying a half page of yesterday's issue sentiments such as these were uttered:

R. L. Prather, Boston: "We feel absolutely optimistic, and our sales are excellent."

F. R. Maxwell, Boston: "The fundamental business conditions are all right; the situation only needs an optimistic spirit to make business boom."

H. T. Colwell, Newburgh, N. Y.: "The business outlook for the coming year never was better."

C. B. Hamilton, Grand Rapids, Mich.: "There is every prospect that 1914 will finish strong."

W. Laughlin, Chicago, Ill.: "The country is bound to be more prosperous."

O. B. Carson, Southbridge, Mass.: "The outlook is excellent."

F. I. Towle, St. Johnsbury, Vt.: "The southwestern territory is in particularly good condition."

A. B. Whitlock, Wheeling, W. Va.: "Our sales are ahead of 1913."

A. B. Pfeiffer, Chicago, Ill.: "Prospects for a big business year."

Frank G. Drew, New Haven, Conn.: "The outlook is very encouraging."

Davis H. Reddie, Springfield, Mass.: "Prosperity is in store for us."

Edward Freshli, Milwaukee, Wis.: "Nineteen hundred and fourteen will be a splendid year for business."

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 20, 1914.]

"The year 1914 should be the greatest in the history of our State." This is the statement of Robert Newton Lynch, the president and manager of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco. Mr. Lynch added: "As far as we have learned from our business contact with other States throughout the country, there is a general rise in confidence all around and a thoroughly optimistic look."

Concerning employment conditions in the West Mr. Lynch declared that, while labor demands were being met, the supply does not exceed the demand, save in seasonal employments.

[From the New York Herald, Feb. 22, 1914.]

#### TRADE CONDITIONS.

##### INDICATIONS FOR GOOD SPRING TRADE.

A. V. Hamburg, president of the Newark Board of Trade, said: "Business is pretty good and orders are coming in well, with indications that the spring trade we are preparing for will materialize."

Attention was called yesterday by an important business man to an anomalous condition faced by the Daily Iron Trade, a Cleveland publication, which about a month ago undertook to collect proof that there was wide depression in the iron, steel, and metal trades of the United States. He exhibited a copy of the publication to show that its own news articles contradicted that assumption. On January 16 last the front page of the Daily Iron Trade, which is an organ for the industry, contained an article under this heading: "Steel trade backs up idle workmen statements."

On page 3 of the same issue appear articles under the following heads: "Structurals in better demand," "See big rail tonnage," "Sheets appear of firmer tone," "Puddling mills to resume work," "Buffalo sold much," "Wire goods in better demand," "Larger bar tonnage."

#### TEXTILES.

Herman W. Block, of the S. S. Stein Co., said: "Letters we are receiving from retailers and from our agents everywhere speak hopefully of the future. Orders which we are receiving are unusually large for this time of the year."

#### TYPEWRITING BUSINESS.

The typewriter industry never was more prosperous or more promising than it is now, according to Harry Bates, of the Underwood Typewriter Co., in its head offices in the Underwood Building in Vesey Street. "Instead of feeling any depressed business condition," he said, "we have been enjoying a continuous boom. Our business is better now than ever before, and contracts in hand indicate unmistakably that it is going to be better still."

"No one thought of crying hard times a year ago, yet business conditions everywhere, as indicated by our business, are better than they were a year ago."

#### WOMEN'S COSTUMES.

I. Lahm, of Lahm & Deutz, women's costume designers, at Nos. 33 and 39 West Thirty-fourth Street, said he expected the biggest season the firm ever has known.

"Already our sales for this year have exceeded by 10 per cent double the sales of this time last year," he said. "Our collections, which until recently were rather slow, are fine now, and our losses for the last several months have reached a minimum. I regard the promises of this business year as nothing short of phenomenal. Merchants who have come here to place their spring orders are actually sending in hurried reorders, saying that business in its present state promises so well that they do not want to be caught short-handed. We find right now that our only trouble is the inability to fill orders, not to sell goods."

#### TRADE IN JEWELRY SPECIALTIES.

Charles Lippman, of the Lippman, Spier & Hahn Co., designers and wholesalers of jewelers' novelties, at No. 1261 Broadway, with branches all over the country and in Europe and South America, said: "Our business, I find, is an excellent index of general conditions. We sell largely to the big department stores, and they buy little of our goods when times are dull, because their customers do not buy many trinkets when they have little money. This year our sales have been heavy, and the quality of the goods has been excellent."

Matthias Stratton, of Alling & Co., manufacturing jewelers, said: "Storms have caused a cessation of orders in our line from the central western section of the country, but otherwise the trade is keeping up. Collections have improved since the first of the year, and jewelry manufacturers generally are working on full time making spring goods, the outlook being good for a brisk demand."

#### AUTOMOBILES.

From the automobile industry comes the particularly optimistic statement of Harry S. Hout, president of the automobile company of that name, which deals principally in Lozier cars, at No. 1751 Broadway.

"This is the eleventh year I have been in the automobile business," said Mr. Hout, "and in January and February of this year I have been more successful than in any other two months since I began. Since the first of the year I have outsold the previous best two months by 14 automobiles."

Arthur B. Underwood, president and manager Riley-Klotz Co., makers of automobile accessories, said: "We are not as busy as we could be, but orders are coming in steadily, and we are hoping that the indications for a brisk trade revival this spring will materialize. There is nothing to croak about, and if the promised forward movement arrives on time we'll all be too busy to even shout for joy."

#### SANGUINE IN CLOTHING TRADE.

An indication of business conditions from the viewpoint of New York business men was shown in a statement by Maurice Brill, of Brill Bros., dealers in men's wearing apparel. "Everyone in our line of business is sanguine," said Mr. Brill. "Manufacturers and importers are going ahead as fast as ever."

#### SHOES AND LEATHER.

Johnson & Murphy, shoe manufacturers, reported a full force, working full time. The season is regarded as a good one, with bright prospects for spring trade.

Weingarten Bros.' corset manufactory is running full time, with a force of about 1,500 workers. Sales for January exceeded those for the same month last year and big orders are coming in.

Whitehead & Hoag, manufacturers of badges, buttons, and novelties, have between 750 and 800 hands working full time, a larger force than was employed a year ago.

Peter Loehnerberg, Atlantic Leather Co., said: "The leather trade has picked up considerably during the last few weeks. Orders are coming in and there are indications that within the next 60 days the leather-making industry will be humming along at a great rate."

#### BRIDGEPORT FACTORIES WORKING TO CAPACITY.

##### BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Threatened disturbances in business having been found mythical, factories here are working at capacity and some of them overtime to meet demands of their trade. Among others, the Union Metallic Cartridge Co. is working overtime.

D. W. Wheeler, secretary of the Acme Shear Co., said: "The business outlook is very good. We can see good business ahead."

S. T. Davis, Jr., president Locomobile Co. of America, said: "As far as our own business is concerned, we know that the tendency is toward improvement. The general sentiment throughout the country is optimistic."

F. J. Kingsbury, president Bridgeport Brass Co., said: "Business is better with us now than at the close of last year. The outlook is for a steadier business than last year."

C. E. Woods, manager of the American Graphophone Co., said: "Up to January 1 we never had such big business, and business at the present is about 20 per cent ahead of last year. There has been no diminution in the export trade."

Charles V. Barrington, secretary Crane Valve Co., said: "We are running full time in our plants here. Everything is picking up and conditions look good for the future. We are shipping to all parts of the United States."

Dever H. Farrer, president Warner Bros. Co., manufacturers of corsets, employing 5,000 persons, said: "We look for normal conditions of business during the year and think that the work being done is bound to be a benefit to the country. We believe that the tariff will adjust itself and that from every viewpoint business is bound to be good. Our export business is increasing."

F. E. Basketz, superintendent of the Fletcher Engineering Co., said: "The business outlook in this country is good. We expect a big year not only from the building operations which have already begun, but from contracts upon which we are asked to bid."

Charles Hutchinson, treasurer Barnum & Bailey Circus, said: "We are expecting one of the biggest years in the circus business which we ever have known. The seating capacity of our big tent has been increased several thousand."

Thomas J. Seward, superintendent Electric Cable Co., said: "With a quiet beginning, we look forward to a good business. Our factory is working full time, with new business in sight for March and April. This is an extremely good outlook for what is usually a bad season."

Lynn W. Wilson said: "Business should be better than normal during the year. Many concerns here are putting on help, and some few are working overtime. At this season of the year outdoor workers are usually without employment. When outdoor occupations are resumed in the spring it will be discovered that the scale of employment is greater than it was a year earlier."



[From the New York Herald, Feb. 21, 1914.]

# MANUFACTURERS REPRESENTING \$500,000,000, IN PROSPERITY CONFERENCES HERE, SEE GREAT BUSINESS YEAR AHEAD.

Sounding a note of present and forthcoming prosperity and of confidence in the stability of the fundamental business principles of this country, more than 50 prominent manufacturers, representing \$500,000,000 of invested capital, met yesterday at the Waldorf-Astoria to consider cooperation for immediate expenditures that would develop trade and bring added volumes of business in the revival that they predict is near at hand.

C. L. Forney, representing Berry Bros., varnish manufacturers: "This year looks fine for us. We have received orders for fine baking jansons for use by concerns in Milan, Italy, and Turin. Business is fine and the prospects are bright. Our Detroit, Walkerville, and San Francisco factories are running all the time and one branch of the Detroit plant is running day and night."

R. L. Prather, advertising manager of the Thomas G. Plant Co., Boston: "We manufacture fine shoes for women. Naturally we come into contact with the best stores, not only in America but abroad. We feel exceptionally optimistic, and our sales are most excellent. We have every confidence that the market is going to be just as good, if not better, as the year advances."

## GOOD OUTLOOK FOR SHOE TRADE.

F. R. Maxwell, vice president of the Thomas G. Plant Co., Boston, shoe manufacturers: "The fundamental business conditions are all right."

H. T. Coldwell, assistant general manager and secretary of the Coldwell Lawn Mower Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: "There is every reason to say that the business outlook for the coming year never was better. It is so with us. Conditions are good for prosperity, and we are going to have a corking year."

## FINE PROSPECTS FOR FURNITURE.

C. B. Hamilton, of the Berkey & Gay Furniture Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.: "There is every prospect that 1914, while it has started slow, will finish strong. Retail stocks are low and every condition points to a successful year."

W. Laughlin, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "With a greater consumption of 'the ham what am,' the country is bound to be more prosperous."

O. B. Carson, advertising manager of the American Optical Co., Southbridge, Mass.: "The outlook for the current year is excellent. Present business is most encouraging. It started slow for the year, but bids fair to end with record business. We have felt no hard times since President Wilson went into office, and we are expecting a general improvement all around."

Frank I. Towle, of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn., and St. Johnsbury, Vt.: "From reports given to us by our salesmen throughout the section west of Chicago we find the southwestern territory in particularly good business and financial condition."

A. B. Whitlock, New York representative of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "Our sales are ahead of the same period in 1913. The prospect is good for the rest of the year."

## ARMOUR & CO. SATISFIED.

A. F. Pfeiffer, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "Prospects and conditions are encouraging for a big business year."

Frank G. Drew, sales manager of the Winchester Repeating Arms Co., New Haven: "Business at present is normal with us. The outlook for 1914 is very encouraging."

David H. Reddie, of Smith & Wesson, Springfield, Mass.: "With conditions fairly normal, we believe that prosperity is in store for us."

John H. Eggers, of the L. E. Waterman Co.: "Business is good and improving, as unsettled conditions are being cleared up."

E. P. Seymour, of the L. E. Waterman Co.: "When uncertain matters of legislation are settled, business will resume activities to proportions heretofore unknown in this country."

H. E. Cragin, representing Armour & Co., Chicago: "Conditions are promising."

Edward Freshl, president of the Holeproof Hosiery Co., Milwaukee, Wis.: "Indications are that 1914 will be a splendid year for business."

George W. Dickerman, vice president of the Remington Typewriter Co.: "There seems to be a better feeling generally to-day, with sounder business conditions."

Walter H. McClure, of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "Conditions are normal; orders are plentiful and prospects are good."

George S. Quay, of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, W. Va.: "The business outlook for 1914 is very bright."

John Rickaby, of the Towle Maple Products Co., St. Paul, Minn.: "The business outlook is, in our opinion, favorable for healthy progress in all legitimate lines."

John J. Gardner, sales manager of the Hull Bros. Umbrella Co., of Toledo, Ohio: "We have every reason to believe this will be our banner year."

Eben C. Spelden, of the International Acheson Graphite Co., Niagara Falls: "Prospects and conditions are encouraging. The Rice Leaders of the World Association represents the most powerful force for the promotion of clean and honest business that ever existed in this or any other country."

Charles M. Steele, vice president and general manager of the Carl M. Green Advertising Agency, Detroit, representing Berry Bros. (Inc.) and the Anderson Electric Car Co.: "Automobile and other business in Detroit show marked improvement. The outlook for the year is very bright."

## FACTORIES RUNNING OVERTIME.

Francis D. Bowman, advertising manager of the Carborundum Co., of Niagara Falls: "We sell grinding wheels and other abrasive products to the factories of the world. When factories are running our products move. At present our plant is running overtime to meet demands. The manufacture of grinding wheels and grinding products is a splendid trade barometer."

George U. Crocker, president of the Simplex Electric Heating Co., of Cambridge, Mass.: "A period of readjustment to new business ideals is closing and a period of advance under new conditions is in sight."

H. H. Whiting, Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., of Minneapolis, Minn.: "The business outlook is very encouraging at the present time."

P. C. Ludlam, general sales manager of the Coldwell Lawn Mower Co., Newburgh, N. Y.: "Business prospects are excellent and the Rice Leaders of the World Association will materially improve the already prosperous business conditions."

Philip F. Hall, National Veneer Products Co., of Mishawaka, Ind.: "Business is 35 per cent ahead of last year, and it looks as if we will hold it for a year."

## BUSINESS IN GLASSWARE GOOD.

J. C. Brady, vice president of the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co., Wheeling, Va.: "Judging solely from our own business, general conditions and prospects are good."

E. C. Waldvogel, assistant general manager of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.: "Business for 1914 will be up to the normal, with more to come."

Lothar W. Faber, of the Eberhard-Faber Pencil Co.: "Present business conditions are normal. The future prospects are favorable, unless interfered with through legislative action."

A. G. Baker, vice president of the Niagara Silk Mills, of North Tonawanda, N. Y.: "Conditions are promising for a good year, and there is every indication of a returning confidence and prosperity."

W. C. Anderson, president of the Anderson Electric Car Co.: "The future depends upon the action of legislation on railroads and corporations. Give prosperity a chance and we will have it."

At the banquet last night at the Waldorf, Job E. Hedges presided, and speeches were made by Isaac F. Marcossan and William B. Howland.

## VOTE OF THANKS TO THE HERALD.

Felicitous speeches were made also by C. B. Hamilton, of the Berkey & Gay Furniture Co., of Grand Rapids; H. Seymour, of the L. E. Waterman Co.; E. Eaton, of the Eaton, Crane & Pike Co.; F. R. Maxwell, vice president of the Thomas G. Plant Co.; and Mr. Rice, all of whom had a tone of hopefulness and praised the purposes of the association.

Mr. Hedges brought up the matter of the Herald's attention to prosperous companies, and said that, as this newspaper had exerted itself toward expressing the optimistic side of the situation, he thought it was in keeping with the purposes of the association to extend a vote of thanks. David H. Reddie, of the Smith & Wesson Co., put the question in the form of a motion, and Edward Freshl, president of the Holeproof Hosiery Co., seconded it. Mr. Hedges then put the subject to a vote, and it was passed unanimously.

Nathan Straus, of New York: "We are entering what will be the greatest era of prosperity the country has known. The grip of Wall Street on the United States has been shaken off by the new currency law. It means that all parts of the country may act on their own initiative without being compelled to consult Wall Street."

B. J. Greenhut, of the Greenhut-Siegel Cooper Co., said there is not the slightest indication of slackening in the speed of business in his house, and in coming in contact with others in the same and associated lines he has learned, he said, that the same feeling of confidence is firmly established throughout the country. There are as many employees at work in the various great business houses throughout the city as there were a year ago, and as far as the Greenhut-Siegel Cooper Co. is concerned, said Mr. Greenhut, business is very healthy indeed and everyone is busy.

## GLASS.

Commenting the Herald's reports on the business situation, Representative EDWIN S. UNDERHILL, of New York, in an interview to-day called attention to the boom conditions in the glass industry. He said:

"It may be of interest to the Herald to know that the Corning (N. Y.) Glass Works is at present enjoying a period of the greatest activity since its establishment 40 years ago. It is the largest glass factory in the United States, employing upward of 1,500 persons. It never employed so many men before and its pay roll was never so large. Corning's leading paper states that the pay roll last week was nearly 30 per cent higher than the corresponding period a year ago, and that one of the blowers received \$45 for his week's work on the piece-work basis, on which the factory operates."

[From New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 3, 1914.]

## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CREDIT MEN ON BUSINESS OUTLOOK.

That business men are more cheerful regarding the outlook is asserted in the February circular letter issued yesterday by the National Association of Credit Men. It says:

"The first month of the new year has clearly given a new note to business. Uncertainty as to what was going to happen next has been giving way during the month to definiteness. Instead of pursuing a policy of self-protection, as business men have thought necessary for several years, they may look forward, in lines where stocks have not been carried over on account of unseasonable weather, with genuine confidence, working aggressively and expansively for business."

"There is a world-wide ease in the money market, a condition almost novel, so long it is since we have been free from financial stress and strain in one or more of the world's centers."

"This note of cheer does not mean that we need be less vigilant in keeping receivables well under control, for no matter how favorable business prospects may be, anything but a close collection policy is bad business."

"It is obvious, from reports reaching the National office, that during the last two months of 1913 slowness in the settlement of merchandise accounts was general. There are two distinctive reasons for this condition: First, unseasonable weather operating against sales of winter stocks; and, second, timidity on the part of the interior banks pending banking and currency legislation."

[From the St. Louis Republic, Feb. 12.]

## GENERAL BUSINESS.

The marked changes in financial conditions in New York to-day are harbingers of a period of great prosperity, according to Ben Althelmer, president of the Althelmer & Rawlings Investment Co., who has just returned from the East.

"There is money everywhere for investment. Interest and discount rates have been lowered. Commercial paper in large amounts is being bought up rapidly by the banks, and new issues of securities are absorbed as quickly as they are offered."

"Banking houses that had prepared February bond circulars to mail to their clients were compelled to withhold them, as the securities were disposed of without the necessity of circularizing."

"Whether this is a natural reaction from the lethargy of business that existed a few months ago, or whether it is caused by the demand resulting from prosperity, I can not say. It is certain, however, that confidence has been restored here and abroad, and Wall Street has proved again that it is not only cold and practical, but also sensitive and sentimental—a contradiction, but a fact."

"There has been no real scarcity of money during the past few months. It was only temporarily out of sight. London and the Continent are again buying our securities, whereas in October and November indifference to American issues was the rule."  
 "The passage of the currency bill, which will give us a fixed status in banking and currency affairs, has much to do with this change of conditions, no doubt. It has given a stimulus and confidence where doubt and hesitancy existed."

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask permission also, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, upon his return from the trip around the country in connection with the organization of the regional banks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY McADOO UPON HIS RETURN FROM A TRIP AROUND THE COUNTRY AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF REGIONAL BANKS.

The committee was presented everywhere with overwhelming evidence of the enormous economic strength of the country and of the rapid progress of every section. The fact that the Nation's banking resources as a whole make enormous advances every 12 or 15 years, approximately doubling in each such period, was made evident. Facts and figures submitted to the committee in every part of the country show amazing growth and strength, and disclosed a condition of financial, industrial, commercial, and agricultural soundness and prosperity that leaves no doubt as to the future.

Mr. SIMMONS. Also an interview of Gov. Craig, of North Carolina, published in the Washington Post, February 23, 1914:

North Carolina was never so prosperous, nor her people so happy, as at present. We have plenty of money, and everyone except a few of our Republican friends is pulling for Wilson. The Democrats have made a great success. They have passed more constructive legislation in the 10 months that Wilson has been in the White House than all the Congresses since the war.

If some of the unemployed men of whom I have read will come to North Carolina, we can give them plenty of work. I believe we could employ 20,000 able-bodied men at once if we could get them.

I wish also, Mr. President, to put in the RECORD certain extracts from the report of the special board of examiners sent during the last month or six weeks by the Secretary of Commerce into the State of Washington to examine into certain charges preferred by a Representative from that State in another body to the effect that about 190 of the mills of that State were under suspension. The report shows that there were no more mills under suspension in December last year than usual under like weather conditions. It also shows that the price of wages has not materially changed since 1908, and that the number of unemployed in the State was no greater in the shingle industry in December, 1913, than at numerous times under similar conditions under the operation of the protective tariff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The closing of the shingle mills in the State of Washington is not an unusual occurrence.

The labor cost of producing shingles in the United States and British Columbia does not differ greatly, if at all.

The cost of timber is probably somewhat greater in the United States than in British Columbia.

American manufacturers are not abandoning their mills nor are they moving to British Columbia. On the other hand, new mills are being built and old ones enlarged in this country.

There has been no reduction of wages in the shingle mills, and in only a very few instances have there been wage reductions in the lumber mills.

There are not more idle men in the State of Washington at this time due to the closing down of shingle mills than there have been at numerous times under a protective tariff.

The list of 194 mills reported closed on December 1, 1913, was not an unusually long one. At some time during every year, practically ever since the development of the shingle industry in the State of Washington, almost all of the interior mills and some of those at tidewater are closed about 60 days. Every man who is now or has been connected with the shingle industry declares that during the winter months a large number of interior mills are forced to close on account of weather conditions. The records of the various shingle associations and the files of the lumber trade journals bear abundant testimony to the fact that in practically no year since the development of the industry have the mills generally been operated more than 10 months.

It is particularly significant that, in order to obtain a list of 194 mills closed, it was necessary to include therein those mills that were always forced to close on account of weather conditions, those that were compelled to close because they had no timber, those that were burned, and those that were bankrupt or in financial distress.

A considerable number of the mills reported closed on December 1 were operating on January 1, 1914, and a still larger number have resumed operations since that time.

In regard to wages, the facts are that there has been no material changes in the rates of wages paid in the shingle industry since 1908.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want also, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD various and sundry statements from magazines and newspapers, such as the Wall Street Journal, the New York Journal of Commerce, the Iron Age, the Square Deal, and a number of other papers and periodicals, which I will not now enumerate, showing the prosperous condition in the steel and iron industry in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Journal of Commerce, Feb. 3, 1914.]

CONDITIONS IN STEEL INDUSTRY IMPROVED.

GARY SOON TO RUN ON FULL TIME.

CHICAGO, January 31.

Conditions in the steel industry at Gary, Ind., improved in the last week, and word was given out by the general managers of the different plants to-day that the mills would be operating to full capacity by the end of February.

The Gary plant of the American Sheet & Tin Plate Co. is now operating at full capacity after a shutdown during December. The American Bridge Co. is operating at three-fourths capacity and is turning out a large order for the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 3, 1914.]

STEEL MILLS FAST GETTING UP TO THEIR FULL CAPACITY.

SHARON.

Blast furnace No. 3 of the Carnegie Steel Co., at Farrell, will start up Wednesday. This means an additional battery of coke ovens will be fired immediately. After Wednesday the Farrell works will be running at the same capacity as before the depression. The tin-plate mill is running at full capacity, for the first time in months. Nearly 8,000 men will be employed at the Farrell mills this week.

Production at the Ohio works of the Carnegie Steel Co. will be increased this week when the billet, sheet-bar, and slab mills will be operated to capacity. One of the Bessemer furnaces that went out of blast some time ago for relining has gone to commission. Two other Bessemer stacks are still being overhauled while out of blast. Prospects are much better now at the Youngstown Carnegie mills.

The Republic Iron & Steel Co. will continue to operate in full, excepting the 20-inch bar mill at the Brown-Bonnell works. During the past week all of the mills were operated to nearly full capacity. At the sheet and tube mills the same department will be in commission this week as were operated last week.

CHICAGO.

The American Sheet & Tin Plate Co., at Gary Ind., is operating to full capacity, and American Bridge Co. at 75 per cent of capacity.

The Illinois Steel Co.'s plant is expected, within a few days, to operate at full capacity, employing 8,570 men, including 1,000 re-employed since last autumn.

PIG-IRON OUTPUT HEAVIER.

Increased buying is reported from different centers of the steel trade. Freer purchases of pig iron are commented on by trade periodicals, and an increase of production in the present month is expected. The Iron Age says: "Iron and steel markets have gained ground in the past week. January buying was so large and the behavior of prices so satisfactory that with the opening of February producers in several finished lines have announced advances of \$1 a ton."

The Iron Trade Review says: "The effect of the increased bookings of iron and steel products in January clearly is being shown in the movement of the market toward higher price levels. The Steel Corporation this week has raised its operations to 75 per cent of steel capacity, and some predictions now are being heard that the steel industry of the whole country will be close to this rate before the end of February. Larger buyers continue to come into the pig-iron market more freely, and the better volume is hardening prices."

[From the Square Deal, February, 1914.]

CONDITIONS IN WEST VIRGINIA IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

WHEELING.

This city and State have shared in the betterment of business, which began with the new year. There has been a marked improvement in every line of industry which was involved in the depression prevailing during the closing weeks of 1913. State Labor Commissioner I. V. Barton's investigations lead him to report a reduction in the ranks of idle workers and fewer inquiries for employment at the bureau conducted by him.

Within a week normal conditions will prevail in the iron and steel mills, and the starting of 5 of the 10 mills of the Wheeling Co.'s new plant at Tiltonville, Ohio, will result in a smaller number of idle men in the steel mills of the district than at any time within a year. The big Carnegie plant at Bellaire is going full blast. The Laughlin in Martins Ferry and the Whitaker in Wheeling, both under the same independent management, are running to capacity. The entire steel department of the Riverside plant at Benwood will be going on the 12th for the first time in many weeks, and Furnace B, which has been undergoing repairs for a long time, will be ready for operation within a few days. At the Wheeling Steel & Iron Co.'s operations in Benwood conditions are normal. The La Belle tin mill, which worked three days a week during December, is now going four and five days a week, with a promise of full operation soon.

In railroad circles conditions as to employment are decidedly brighter. At the Benwood yards of the Baltimore & Ohio most of the men who were laid off during December are back at their jobs.

Coal-mining operations throughout the State were not much affected by the depression late in 1913, and it is the confident prediction of several prominent operators that all records for coal output in West Virginia will be broken in 1914.

In the glass and pottery industries conditions are not the brightest, but manufacturers are optimistic. The plants at Newell, W. Va., are running, and the biggest independent glass factory in the world, at Moundsville, W. Va., is going to full capacity. The Owens machine plants at Fairmont and Clarksburg are turning out all the bottles the machines will make. The Central factory in Wheeling, Senator Scott's plant, is enjoying a prosperous run. The glass factories are still experiencing difficulty in securing boys.

The enamel plants in Moundsville and Bellaire are doing fairly well. The latter will be in part removed to other locations, but the departments retained by Bellaire are going full tilt.

PITTSBURGH.

Following four months of depression and gloom, the industries of the Pittsburgh district are brightening up again as 1914 grows older. The steel business is the barometer of conditions here. The estimated production in the district for the first two weeks of the year is 100,000 tons per week. For the three months previous the production had



dwindled to between 60,000 and 65,000 tons per week, making the increase for the first two weeks of the year more than 33 per cent.

Plants in the Pittsburgh district that have not turned a wheel for weeks are resuming operations, bringing back employment to thousands of men. During the dull period mills of the United States Steel Corporation in Sharon, Farrell, New Castle, Homestead, Pittsburgh proper, and other places in this district were forced to close down. These are all opening up and the majority are running full time now.

That the steel manufacturers are not alarmed is proven by the improvements they are making to their plants. Eight companies in the Pittsburgh district are constructing additional open-hearth furnaces that will give them an additional total annual capacity of 2,113,000 tons.

[Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, Feb. 2, 1914.]

MERCHANT IRON SALES IN JANUARY, 900,000 TONS—EQUAL TO TOTAL ORDERS IN JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH, 1913—HEAVIEST MONTH'S BUSINESS SINCE APRIL, 1912—LESS ACTIVITY LAST WEEK—SMALL ADVANCE IN PRICES ACCOMPANIED THE LARGER TRANSACTIONS—STEEL-MAKING IRON DULL.

Merchant furnaces booked orders for 900,000 tons of pig iron in the various distributing districts during the month of January. This is the largest tonnage booked during a single month since April, 1912, and equals the total orders placed during the first quarter of 1913. In January last year total contracts were 400,000 tons, and the heaviest buying last year was in July, when total orders were 565,000 tons.

IMPORTS, THREE MONTHS, IRON AND STEEL.

Mr. SIMMONS. That the iron and steel industry is not suffering from an invasion from other markets as a result of the lower tariff duties is shown by the fact that during the last three months of the past year, after the tariff bill went into effect, importations of this product fell off 332,000 tons.

Total iron and steel imported and exported during the months of October, November, and December, 1912 and 1913.

	Imports.		Exports.	
	1912	1913	1912	1913
	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.	Dollars.
October.....	2,773,916	2,574,978	25,271,559	25,189,745
November.....	2,793,448	2,495,063	26,406,425	20,142,141
December.....	2,649,485	2,814,774	23,750,864	22,616,701

The imports for the three months in 1912 were \$8,216,849, and imports for the three months in 1913 were \$7,884,845, a falling off under the new tariff of \$332,004.

Mr. President, I have covered all the ground that I laid out to cover. There are other phases of the speech of the Senator from California which I should like to have taken up, but I knew I would not have time to discuss all of the subjects that he entered upon. Yet I desired to put in the RECORD some substantive matter upon the general conditions of the country, labor conditions, and business conditions, which I thought ought to be given to the people.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. THOMAS. I was not aware that the Senator from Utah had the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. I will yield to the Senator, if he so desires.

Mr. THOMAS. No; my purpose, Mr. President, was to ask for a unanimous-consent order with reference to the unfinished business, but I will do so later.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. THORNTON. With the permission of the Senator from Utah, I should like to ask if he proposes at this time to discuss Senate joint resolution No. 1?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will state that joint resolution No. 1 is not before the Senate at this time; it has been temporarily laid aside—

Mr. THORNTON. I beg pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. With the understanding, however, that if any Senator desired to speak upon it, he could proceed this afternoon.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, I had expected briefly to speak to the Senate on the joint resolution. I did not know that it had been temporarily laid aside. I only reached here at 3 o'clock, and I understood the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] was replying to some remarks made this morning by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS].

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am not going to occupy very much time, and the Senator can follow, if he shall so desire. I am sure he will have plenty of time to do so this afternoon.

Mr. THORNTON. Very well.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should not take a moment of the time of the Senate this afternoon to answer the Senator

from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] if he had not referred to the value of importations of foreign goods and to the volume of our exportations for the last three months.

The Senator is mistaken as to both. I am not going to fill the RECORD, as the Senator has done, with newspaper clippings with a view of proving the country was never so prosperous. The Senator and everyone else know that is not the case. I could fill thousands of pages of the RECORD with newspaper clippings apparently proving that the industries of this country are in the throes of distress from one end of the land to the other. I do not believe it any more than I believe that there is no suffering among the laboring men for want of employment. The Senator, in having printed in the RECORD as he has newspaper clippings from papers which perhaps he did not know existed, written from a biased point of view, will never convince the American people of the accuracy of the statement made, particularly not in that way, nor will he convince the hundreds of thousands of American wage earners at present out of employment.

I wish the industries and institutions of the United States were as prosperous as the Senator from North Carolina claims them to be. I wish every mill, every factory, and every industrial plant in all the land were so busy with orders they could not possibly fill them, as was the case before the passage of the present tariff act.

Mr. President, there is no need of our deceiving ourselves. There is no need of taking partisan newspaper reports as testimony. We have, in the Treasury Department, accounts kept of the value of every dollar of goods imported into this country and every dollar of custom duties collected. Every Senator has that information or can secure it any day of the week or month. I am going to confine what I have to say to the absolute figures given by the department. I shall state in dollars and cents the exact amounts, and I shall leave the people to decide whether the results of the present tariff act have been to the advantage of the people as a whole or whether it has not.

Mr. President, take the month of November, 1913, as compared with the month of November, 1912. The importations for November, 1912, were \$153,004,893. The importations for November, 1913, were \$148,216,536.

For December, 1912, the importations were \$154,095,444. For December, 1913, they were \$184,587,571.

In January of 1913 the importations were \$163,063,438. In January of 1914 they were \$154,469,263.

That is to say, Mr. President, during those three months under the Payne-Aldrich tariff act the importations were \$470,253,780; under the present law for the corresponding months they were \$487,273,370, or a difference of importations during the three months of \$17,019,590. The imports in those three months of 1912-13 were less than for the corresponding months of 1913-14 by \$17,019,590.

That is only one side of the picture. What is the other? Let us see what the Government collected in revenue from goods imported during those months.

In November, 1912, there was collected customs revenues of \$25,666,353. In November, 1913, there was collected \$21,173,623. In December, 1912, there was collected \$24,248,161. In December, 1913, there was collected \$21,510,140. In January, 1913, there was collected \$29,334,124. In January, 1914, there was collected \$23,528,080.

Taking the total for the three months there was collected in customs revenues during that part of the years 1912-13 \$79,248,638, and during the same three months of the years 1913-14 but \$66,211,828, or a loss in revenue in those three months of \$13,036,810, with an increase of importations of \$17,019,590.

In other words, Mr. President, the American workman was prevented from the making of \$17,000,000 worth of goods, and the Treasury of the United States lost \$13,036,810.

I must admit there has been an increase of revenue from one source since the inauguration of the Democratic administration, for I find that the ordinary internal-revenue receipts from October 2, 1913, to February 18, 1914, were \$78,447,507.93, and from October 2, 1912, to February 18, 1913, were but \$75,780,164.84, showing an increase of revenue derived from the sale and consumption of beer, whisky, tobacco, and so forth, of \$2,667,343.09, and at a time when other industries of the country were suffering from Democratic legislation, notwithstanding the claim made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that conditions never were so prosperous and newspaper clippings submitted by him as proof positive of the same.

Mr. President, taking the month of December and taking the following items—manufactures of aluminum, parts of automobiles, clocks and parts of clocks, watches and parts of watches, cotton goods, knit goods, burials, fruits and nuts, glass and glassware, cutlery, tin plate, gloves, linoleum and oil-

cloths, paper and manufactures of paper, pencils and pencil leads, manufactures of silk, wool and manufactures of wool, and wood pulp—what do we find? Of those items alone during the month of December, 1912, there were imported into this country \$18,660,970. During the month of December, 1913, there were imported into this country of those items \$28,912,679, an increase in importations of those items alone of \$10,251,709 and an increase on all goods imported during December of \$30,492,127, and with that increase of importations there was a loss of \$2,738,021 to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, an increase of \$30,000,000 of goods imported from foreign countries in one month means that many less goods made in the United States. Who has been benefited by this? Certainly not the vast number of unemployed workmen in this country. It would have taken thousands of them to have produced this \$30,000,000 worth of goods. This is lost to the American workmen, and the foreign laborers have received the money that was necessary to produce that amount of goods.

I should not find so much fault with that if the consumer in this country had been benefited to the extent of the cost of producing the \$30,000,000, but the fact is that the ultimate consumer has not been benefited one iota by the increase in the importations of this class of goods.

I have not been able to obtain the value of the importations for February, 1914, in order that I might compare them with February, 1913, as the Treasury Department has not yet gotten them out for February, 1914. I wish, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we do have the receipts of customs for February, 1914, and can compare them with the year 1913. For the year 1913 the receipts were \$27,605,115.83, and for February, 1914, they were but \$17,609,603.70, or a loss to the Treasury of the United States for that one month of nearly \$10,000,000.

As I said before, if the ultimate consumer received the benefit of this difference there would be some reason for approval; but, Mr. President, the amount of reduction in duties that has been made in the present tariff law is not passed on to the ultimate consumer. The importer takes a part of it; the foreign manufacturer has taken a part of it; the distributor of goods in this country has taken a part of it; and I doubt whether a Senator here can point to an item which the ultimate consumer purchases for less money on account of the reduction in rates of duties. The middlemen buy for less, I admit, in many cases.

I did intend to take up the question of the amount of importations in certain lines of goods for the month of February and show that up to this time the foreign manufacturers had not adjusted their business so as to take care of their own trade and also extend it to the American market. I wish to say, however, that I do not believe the increase of importations has fairly begun, nor do I believe it will do so until, perhaps, after the election this fall. If the country votes to approve the tariff bill, I have not the least doubt but that the foreign manufacturers will immediately prepare to enter this market; and they can do it. There is no question in my mind about that, nor is there any question in the mind of the manufacturers of foreign countries but that they can do it.

I met here not long ago one of the largest manufacturers in England. He was in my office, and I asked him if he was prepared to make goods for the American market. He said: "Only by increasing the hours of labor; but after the fall election, if the present tariff act is approved by the American people, I expect to increase my plant, and I expect to make a fight for the American market." There is no question in my mind but that that will be done, not only by him but by thousands of others.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Utah, I will say inasmuch as he knew I expected to address the Senate this afternoon that, so far as I am concerned, he is entirely at liberty to proceed as long as he wishes.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I am passing over a great deal of what I intended to say this afternoon. I promise the Senator that I will be through in a very few minutes.

Mr. THORNTON. I request the Senator not to hurry on my account.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] referred to the importation of cattle and horses and products of the farm, and said that when the bill was passed he really thought there would be an increase. He also said that the importations into this country of products of the farm were negligible and that they amounted to practically nothing. Mr. President, I have here the total importations of such products for four months under the tariff act of 1913 and 1914, and I want to say that the value of those prod-

ucts imported under the present law was \$38,006,107, while the value of those same items for the same four months of a year ago, imported under the Payne-Aldrich bill, amounted to but \$10,883,810.

I picked up the other evening the handbook of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and I went through their estimates of importations. The committee based their rates upon the importations that they estimated would come into this country. I was very much surprised to see that their forecast for the year on cattle was \$5,570,000, although we have already imported for the first four months under the law \$10,110,948. Their forecast for the year on horses was \$612,500. We have already imported \$933,634. Their forecast for eggs was \$210,000. We have already imported \$612,700 in four months.

Mr. President, I could go on along the list and tell the Senate of each item, showing that the forecasts and estimates upon which the present rates were based are absolutely worthless.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. GORE. My recollection is that when these estimates were submitted to the House there was a duty on cattle in the House bill which was removed in the Senate. I may not be correct as to that, but that is my recollection; and I have the same recollection as to eggs.

Mr. SMOOT. The rates on eggs and cattle, I think, were left the same. There was a change made in the rate on horses. Oats were made free in the House.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken as to cattle. My recollection is that the House put meats on the free list, but retained a duty on cattle, and I think the same was true of eggs. It is easily verified.

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, can be very easily verified. It makes no special difference, however, because if I had the time I could go through the whole list, and cattle would be only one item showing the same relative increase. As far as that is concerned, on nearly everything that is produced on the farm the increase of importations has been away beyond any estimate made in the House and away beyond the dreams of any speaker in the Senate. No one on the other side supposed the importations could amount to any such figures as they have actually proved to be.

Mr. President, it is so late that I feel that I do not want to discuss the questions to-night that I intended to. Some suitable occasion may arise, however, within the next day or two. I shall therefore avail myself of the first opportunity to answer a number of statements that were made to-day by the Senator from North Carolina. I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] desires to make a motion at this time, and I am perfectly willing to defer my remarks to a later date.

Mr. THOMAS obtained the floor.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I yield for the moment to the Senator from Indiana.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, of course, I shall have no objection to the adjournment, but I desire to give notice that immediately following the routine morning business on Monday next I shall address the Senate on Senate resolution 164, which makes a request for information with reference to Mexican affairs, and that I shall also ask to have read at that time Senate resolution 139, on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN].

The motion was agreed to.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that it is evident that we shall not be able to get a vote to-day upon Senate joint resolution No. 1, and the further fact that some Senators who desire to be present when the vote is taken will not be here at an earlier time, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote upon the joint resolution and all amendments at an hour not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant. I presume a roll call will be necessary for that purpose.



The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Fall	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brady	Gore	Oliver	Sutherland
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Overman	Swanson
Bristow	Hughes	Owen	Thomas
Bryan	James	Pomerene	Tillman
Burton	Jones	Reed	Townsend
Catron	Kenyon	Robinson	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Kern	Root	Walsh
Chilton	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Clapp	Lodge	Sheppard	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Martin, Va.	Sherman	Works
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Shively	

Mr. REED. I again announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE] on account of sickness. I make this announcement generally for the day and during his absence. He is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. Out of order I ask to be permitted to introduce a joint resolution which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The SECRETARY. A joint resolution creating a joint committee of Congress, and authorizing said committee to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, the property known as Monticello, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me to make a request?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I wish to make a point of order. I should like to know if it would not be necessary to call the roll again if the proposition to submit a unanimous consent is made and then business is done in the meantime?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to rule that the roll call must proceed again.

Mr. THOMAS. I can not yield if that is the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely wish to ask to have some printing done. Do I understand the Chair to rule that I can not make a request to print a document without a call for a quorum beforehand?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair has ruled that when a roll call is had for the purpose of presenting a unanimous-consent agreement, if business intervenes the roll call must be had again before the unanimous-consent agreement can be presented.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry, then, Mr. President. May I ask what business has intervened since the roll was called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has introduced a joint resolution by the consent of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. REED. I presume there is no way to rectify the matter now unless I can withdraw the joint resolution. I do not want to put the Senate to the inconvenience of another roll call.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not wish to yield if by doing so I shall put the Senate to the inconvenience of another roll call.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not yield unless it be for some inquiry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I simply wanted to inquire of the Senator if he would not ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] be allowed to withdraw the bill which he introduced and that the unanimous-consent agreement asked by the Senator from Colorado be stated to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. I ask that unanimous consent be given the Senator from Missouri to withdraw the joint resolution I just offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Will that avoid the difficulty which has been suggested?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will so rule.

Mr. REED. Very well; I concur in the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The joint resolution is withdrawn. The Senator from Colorado will state his proposed agreement.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that at the hour of 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that debate as to all amendments thereafter offered be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator speaking thereon.

I will state to the Senate that I fixed the hour of 2 o'clock on the 10th instant for the purpose of accommodating Senators who can not be here at an earlier time and who desire particularly to be here and to participate in the voting.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is, the debate is limited to 15-minute speeches on the amendments or on the joint resolution?

Mr. THOMAS. On amendments which are offered after the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. On the joint resolution itself?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to have the consent agreement stated by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that at the hour of 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments then pending, and that debate as to all amendments thereafter offered be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator speaking thereon.

Mr. LANE. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the hour be 4 o'clock. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] gave notice that he is going to occupy a portion of the time on Monday.

Mr. THOMAS. I am willing to make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. LANE. I believe in free speech and lots of it. We have heard a good deal and I should like to hear more.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well; I will make it 4 o'clock.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator if this proposed unanimous-consent agreement would not permit unlimited debate after the hour named, provided it was on an amendment that had been offered prior to that hour?

Mr. THOMAS. It would practically amount to that, if amendments were offered.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator wants to reach that, it seems to me he ought to meet that contingency.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to meet the wishes of all with reference to the form of the agreement.

Mr. NORRIS. I will ask the Senator if there would be any objection to striking out the word "thereafter"? I think that would cover it then.

Mr. THOMAS. If that were done, then there certainly would be unlimited debate afterwards, because there is a pending amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand as to a pending amendment or any other amendment that might be offered between now and 2 o'clock on Tuesday there could be unlimited debate. So if anyone wanted to prolong the debate to an unlimited extent, the agreement really means nothing.

Mr. THOMAS. There would be unlimited debate in the sense that addresses might be made limited each to 15 minutes.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I do not understand the agreement in that way.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly; it reads that way.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I did not get it right when it was read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understood it exactly as the Senator from Nebraska understands it. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Colorado that if the limitation upon debate on any amendment offered after 2 o'clock is 15 minutes—and that is all the unanimous-consent agreement says about it—it will be perfectly proper for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] or any other Senator to take the floor upon the amendment pending offered by the Senator from Mississippi and speak the entire time up to the time we would be compelled to vote, and that would cut off debate upon everything else.

Mr. THOMAS. That is not the design of the agreement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have no doubt that is not the design, but I think that would be the effect.

Mr. THOMAS. The limit I suggest is 15 minutes for each Senator upon a subsequent amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the trouble is the amendment I am talking about—that proposed by the Senator from Mississippi—is not a subsequent amendment; it is an amendment pending now.

Mr. THOMAS. So it can be discussed up to the hour of voting.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly; that is what I am complaining of.

Mr. NORRIS. Why could not only that amendment but any other be discussed after the joint resolution is passed? All a Senator would have to do in order to talk longer than the time

mentioned would be to simply say "I am talking on this amendment which has been offered."

Mr. THOMAS. It is quite evident, to my mind, that the hour fixed in the agreement will be reached before we agree upon it. Therefore I am perfectly willing to accept any suggestion that may be desired for the purpose of reaching an agreement.

Mr. JAMES. Why does not the Senator from Colorado suggest an hour when we shall commence to vote upon the pending joint resolution and all amendments without debate?

Mr. LODGE. Without debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Because there is objection to it.

Mr. JAMES. I have not heard that suggested.

Mr. THOMAS. There might be no objection made, but the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow] suggested differently, and I accepted his suggestion and I thought it would be satisfactory.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator if there would be any objection to his including in the request, before or after the words "to be offered thereafter," the words "upon the bill and pending amendments or amendments to be offered."

Mr. THOMAS. No; not on my part.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think that would confine the debate to 15 minutes to each Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. My impression is that the anticipated trouble will not arise. However, I am willing that that shall be inserted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock p. m. Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that the debate upon the resolution itself, on amendments that may be then pending, and on amendments that may be offered shall thereafter be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. That is satisfactory to me if it is to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Colorado how we can proceed to vote if the right to debate is open?

Mr. THOMAS. This is precisely the rule which the Senate made by unanimous consent in the Alaska Railway case.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And we got into an awful trouble.

Mr. JAMES. That was because the Alaska consent agreement provided that we should vote on the calendar day, as I understand it. There is no provision here for a calendar day. That was the trouble in the Alaskan case. The two agreements are not at all similar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the unanimous-consent agreement is adopted the Chair asks the Senator proposing it to construe what it means. If the Senate is going to vote at 4 o'clock on the joint resolution and the amendments, the Chair is impressed with the idea that it means to vote at 4 o'clock and the subsequent discussion would be after the voting. I have heard that in the Senate, but it can not accomplish any purpose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it seems to me it ought to be that after 4 o'clock debate be limited to 15 minutes on the joint resolution and any amendment that is pending or which may be offered. Then we will reach an end.

Mr. THOMAS. My personal preference would be to arbitrarily fix 4 o'clock as the time to vote on the measure and all amendments. The Senator from Kansas, however, suggests the necessity or expediency of considering amendments which may then be offered. If the suggestion made by the Senator from Iowa is agreeable to the Senator from Kansas it is to me.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no objection to an agreement that will limit debate to any hour, I care not how soon it may be, and that as soon as that debate is over that we vote. But an agreement which says that at 4 o'clock we shall proceed to vote, accompanied with an arrangement for debating after that time, it seems to me, is very inconsistent; that it is impossible to be either applied or understood.

Mr. THOMAS. I have cited the only precedent for it that I am aware of.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement be restated to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will restate it.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that at the hour of 4 o'clock upon Tuesday, the 10th instant, the Senate shall proceed to vote upon Senate joint resolution No. 1 and all amendments thereto, and that debate thereafter, as to all amendments—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We can not debate after we commence to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the query the Chair was propounding.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The consent must be stated in writing, of course. It is not half understood, nor is it even formulated.

Mr. THOMAS. My own suggestion would be to have the agreement end where the Secretary stopped reading.

Mr. CUMMINS. Is not this what the Senator from Colorado seeks to accomplish, that after 4 o'clock on Tuesday the debate shall be limited to 15 minutes for each Senator?

Mr. THOMAS. That is not all I want to accomplish, but I assume that is all I can accomplish.

Mr. CUMMINS. If debate is open for 15 minutes to each Senator—

Mr. THOMAS. I was going to say that that is all I assume I will be able to accomplish, in view of the suggestions made to me as to what the agreement shall contain.

Mr. JAMES. That is some relief.

Mr. CUMMINS. What further would the Senator from Colorado like to accomplish?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I venture to make a very modest suggestion. It is that in place of agreeing to commence to vote at 4 o'clock the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution and amendments and then limit the debate.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is the suggestion I have just made to the Senator from Colorado. It is what he evidently intends.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire whether that fixes the hour of 4 o'clock for voting?

Mr. GALLINGER. That can follow. We proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution at a certain hour—at 2 o'clock—and then, at 4 o'clock, debate can be limited on the bill and amendments. I apprehend there will be very few amendments offered.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not see, Mr. President, with all deference to the superior experience of the Senator from New Hampshire, that that changes the matter very much.

Mr. GALLINGER. The only difficulty is, Mr. President, as I think the Senator will appreciate, that the proposition of the Senator is that we shall proceed to vote at a certain hour and then that debate shall follow.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. THOMAS. With pleasure.

Mr. ROOT. I suggest that, starting with the original proposition, it be put in this form: That after 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, debate on joint resolution No. 1 be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day the Senate shall proceed to vote upon the resolution and all amendments thereto without further debate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should object to that. I object to any agreement to vote at a specific hour without further debate, because, under such an arrangement, amendments may be offered which can not even be explained. An amendment such as has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] may be put in here at any time. I shall object to any request for unanimous consent unless there be allowed 15 minutes debate by each Senator on the joint resolution and all amendments that may be offered to it.

Mr. THOMAS. If that is the case, I think I will withdraw my request.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I would suggest, to avoid the difficulty suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow], that the Senator from New York amend his request for unanimous consent by providing that no amendment shall be offered after 2 o'clock.

Mr. BRISTOW. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. I would object to that.

Mr. NORRIS. Since the Senator from Colorado has withdrawn his request and objected to another request, I should like to submit a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. THOMAS. I have not objected to any request. The Senator from Kansas having objected, I perceive the folly of attempting to agree to anything. Therefore I withdraw my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood the Senator from Kansas to say that he would make no objection if 15-minute speeches were allowed on each amendment. I ask unanimous consent that after 2 o'clock on Tuesday next debate on Senate joint resolution No. 1 shall be limited to speeches of not exceeding 15 minutes, so that no Senator would be allowed to speak more than 15 minutes on any amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. On the joint resolution.

Mr. GRONNA. I should object to that, unless the Senator includes 15-minute speeches on the joint resolution itself.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to putting that in. I will modify the request to make it 15 minutes on any amendment or



on the joint resolution itself, and that the vote shall be taken when there is no Senator who desires to speak and when there are no further amendments to be offered.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state his question of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the submission of another proposition for unanimous consent by the Senator from Nebraska require another roll call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks not. The same question is still before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can not see any advantage to be gained by putting the discussion off until Tuesday when we could go right along on Monday. Therefore I object to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I have tried to amend the form which I suggested. It seemed to be satisfactory except in one respect, and I have amended it to meet the objection, so as to read: "That after 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the 10th instant, debate on Senate joint resolution No. 1 be limited to 15 minutes for each Senator, and that at 4 o'clock p. m. on that day the Senate vote upon the joint resolution and all amendments thereto without further debate, except under the 15-minute rule upon amendments thereafter offered."

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall object to that. I suggest that we get the Secretary to draw a unanimous-consent agreement. I believe he could draw one which would be satisfactory to the Senate.

I have not had an opportunity to speak on the pending joint resolution, and I want at least 15 minutes. I suggest that unanimous consent be asked to take the joint resolution up for consideration at not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday, and that no Senator shall speak more than once and not to exceed 15 minutes upon the joint resolution itself or any amendment after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LANE. I object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. The only purpose of a unanimous-consent order is to get a vote and dispose of a pending measure. None of these requests do that, and therefore the unanimous consent, if granted, would be worthless.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Oh, Mr. President, I do not agree with that. Unanimous-consent agreements are entered into for the purpose of hastening action in this body.

Mr. LODGE. This will not hasten it.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I think this will hasten it very materially, because if we begin the discussion at 2 o'clock on Tuesday and every Senator thereafter is limited to 15 minutes, he will only make a 15-minute talk upon something in which he is particularly interested. There probably would be no amendments offered after that time, or, if any should be offered, they would be few, and there would not be very much time consumed in their discussion. It seems to me that something will be accomplished by this suggestion for unanimous consent.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that that is true, but it seems like those who have spoken the most and who are most favorable to this joint resolution are the least anxious to have a vote on it.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, as no agreement has been reached, and as there does not seem to be the prospect of any, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withhold that suggestion until the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator who has objected is placed before the Senate. We have gotten down now to where there is a request for unanimous consent made by the Senator who objected to all the other requests for unanimous consent, and perhaps we can agree with him on a time for a vote.

Mr. KERN. I withhold my motion for the present.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the Secretary read the unanimous-consent agreement as proposed by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from North Dakota a unanimous-consent agreement to propose?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of joint resolution No. 1 not later than 2 o'clock on Tuesday next, and that after 2 o'clock on that day no Senator shall speak more than once nor more than 15 minutes upon the joint resolution itself nor upon any amendment that is pending or that may be offered to it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I will cheerfully agree to any request for unanimous consent that will bring the Senate to a vote at any specified time, but, personally, I do not care to

agree to any request that seems to me to be meaningless. Under the rules of the Senate this joint resolution comes up at 2 o'clock on Monday, and we do not need a unanimous-consent agreement to bring it up at 2 o'clock. The suggestions made propose a limitation of the time of debate, and the only valuable thing in a unanimous-consent agreement is to fix a time when we shall vote and dispose of a pending measure. None of the proposed unanimous-consent agreements do that; and so I object.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator from Massachusetts answer a question?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. CUMMINS. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is demanded.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1914.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

I hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Industrial Expositions.

Respectfully,

HENRY F. ASHURST,  
United States Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Arizona is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1914.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE:

I herewith tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Coast Defenses.

Sincerely,

JAMES E. MARTINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from New Jersey is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SENATE CHAMBER, February 6, 1914.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

President of the Senate.

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Respectfully, yours,

BLAIR LEE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Maryland is accepted.

Mr. KERN. I present a letter from the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER,  
Washington.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

I desire to hereby tender my resignation as chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM J. STONE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resignation of the Senator from Missouri is accepted.

On motion of Mr. KERN it was

Ordered, That HENRY F. ASHURST, a Senator from Arizona, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator STONE, of Missouri;

That JAMES E. MARTINE, a Senator from New Jersey, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Industrial Expositions to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator ASHURST, of Arizona;

That BLAIR LEE, a Senator from Maryland, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Coast Defenses to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator MARTINE, of New Jersey; and

That WILLIAM STANLEY WEST, a Senator from Georgia, is hereby designated and appointed chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Senator LEE, of Maryland.

#### PURCHASE OF MONTICELLO.

Mr. REED. Out of order I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) creating a joint committee of Congress and authorizing said committee to acquire by purchase or condemnation the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson, and the family graveyard in which his remains were interred, with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary in order to carry out the various public objects

and purposes in said resolution set forth, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va., was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) creating a joint committee of Congress, and authorizing said committee to acquire, by purchase or condemnation, the property known as Monticello, and embracing the former home of Thomas Jefferson and the family graveyard in which his remains were interred, with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary in order to carry out the various public objects and purposes in said resolution set forth, all of said property being located in Albemarle County, Va.

Whereas the Senate and House of Delegates of the State of Virginia have passed the following resolutions:

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to acquire Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson.

"Whereas Monticello, the home of the immortal Thomas Jefferson, is now private property, and the public has no right of access thereto; and

"Whereas the buildings were placed, the grounds laid out, and the work of construction carried on under the presiding genius of that great statesman, thus in itself forming a fitting memorial to his greatness; and

"Whereas in the shadows of its walls lie the earthly remains of him who was the author of the Declaration of Independence, of the statute for religious freedom in Virginia, and father of the University of Virginia; and

"Whereas by the side of the great leader rest the remains of three other great Virginians—Dabney Carr, the member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, whose resolutions established the Committees of Correspondence between the sister colonies; William Cary Nichols, governor of Virginia and friend of Thomas Jefferson; and Thomas Mann Randolph, governor of Virginia and son-in-law of Thomas Jefferson; and

"Whereas his wife, his children, and his grandchildren to the fifth generation rest by his side on the lonely mountain which he loved so well; and none but his descendants have the legal right to enter the shrine, where all lovers of popular government would gladly repair to pay a tribute of love and devotion and to seek from the works which he wrought the inspiration of his wonderful life; and

"Whereas his services as governor of Virginia, as minister to France, Secretary of State, and President of the United States, together with his political genius shown in the foundation of our Government and shaping her destiny, has made him the patron saint of all parties and his home the mecca of all lovers of liberty in thought and action: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring)—*

"1. That the General Assembly of Virginia does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States, now in session in the city of Washington, to acquire Monticello, the home of Thomas Jefferson, to be held in trust for all the people of the Nation.

"2. That the general assembly does hereby request the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from Virginia to use all legitimate means to accomplish this end.

"3. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and to each of the Representatives from Virginia in the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

*"Agreed to by house of delegates, February 11, 1914.*

*"JOHN W. WILLIAMS,  
"Clerk House of Delegates.*

*"Agreed to by the senate, February 16, 1914.*

*"O. V. HANGER,  
"Clerk of the Senate."*

And

Whereas hundreds of thousands of patriotic American citizens have petitioned Congress to the same effect: Now, therefore, for the reasons aforesaid, and for the reasons hereinafter set forth, be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby created a joint committee of Congress, to consist of six members, three of whom shall be Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three of whom shall be Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The six persons so named shall constitute a joint committee of Congress, and shall be known as the Monticello purchase or condemnation committee.

SEC. 2. That the members of said committee shall continue to hold the positions aforesaid until the objects and purposes of this resolution have been accomplished, or until their successor or successors are appointed and qualified: *Provided*, That the term of any member shall cease at the termination of his term of office as a Member of Congress, at which time a successor may be appointed by the President of the Senate or Speaker of the House of Representatives, as provided in section 1 hereof. Any member of said committee may be removed by a vote of the branch of Congress of which he is a Member. They shall serve without salary or other compensation, but in lieu of subsistence while absent from the city of Washington or their usual places of abode and engaged in the business of the committee they shall be paid \$5 per day and their ordinary traveling expenses.

SEC. 3. That the committee shall at once proceed to negotiate with the owner or owners of the property hereinafter described for the purchase of the same for and on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. If said committee shall receive from the owner or owners of said properties within 30 days after this act shall become a law a proposition in writing to sell said properties to the United States Government at a price which to said committee seems just and reasonable, and said price is further approved by the President of the United States, as in his opinion just and reasonable, then said committee is authorized to purchase said properties and to draw a warrant against the Treasurer of the United States in favor of said owner or owners for the said purchase price; and it is hereby made the duty of the Treasurer to pay the same: *Provided*, That in no event shall the price paid exceed the unexpended portion of the amount hereinafter appropriated.

SEC. 4. That if the owner or owners of said properties shall not within the period of 30 days aforesaid propose to sell said property upon terms deemed by said committee and the President to be just and reasonable, as aforesaid, or shall fail to convey the same with title satis-

factory to the committee, then said committee is authorized to notify the Attorney General of the United States of such refusal or failure, and thereupon it shall become the duty of the Attorney General to bring and prosecute in the name of the United States of America proceedings to condemn and take such property, or such part thereof as may be designated by the committee, for the following public uses, namely: To create a public park for the convenience and use of the people of the United States; to preserve the historic mansion house which was erected by and occupied as the home of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia; to afford a suitable site on which shall be hereafter erected a monument to his memory, which shall bear appropriate tablets and inscriptions reciting and permanently preserving a concise record of the services rendered by him to the American people and the cause of human liberty; to protect and adorn the grave in which reposes his immortal dust. Said mansion house shall be preserved, and, together with such other buildings as may hereafter be erected upon said grounds, shall be used as a repository in which shall be kept original manuscripts and writings of Thomas Jefferson, especially those connected with his public acts and the public history of the times in which he lived, with such other valuable public and historic documents as the committee shall deem proper. There shall also be collected and conserved in said mansion house and buildings the relics associated with his private life and public services. Said grounds, buildings, writings, and properties shall be acquired for the purposes aforesaid, and shall be kept and maintained for the public benefit, and to enhance the respect and love of the citizens of the United States for their common country, and in order that the truth of history may be preserved for the benefit of the present and future generations.

SEC. 5. That said committee shall be permanent in its character, and shall have the care and custody of said properties, and shall conserve and preserve the same, and shall perform such other duties as may from time to time be designated by Congress.

SEC. 6. That the properties so to be purchased or taken shall embrace the home and family graveyard of Thomas Jefferson, in Albemarle County, Va., together with such lands and grounds appurtenant thereto as the committee shall find necessary to the carrying out of the objects and purposes aforesaid.

SEC. 7. That if at any time during the pendency of such condemnation proceedings the committee shall be able to purchase at private sale, it may do so upon the terms and conditions aforesaid.

SEC. 8. That there is hereby appropriated for the purposes of paying the expenses of said committee and the purchase price, and the expenses incurred in acquiring said properties, either at private sale or by condemnation, the sum of \$500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any moneys in the hands of the Treasurer not otherwise appropriated.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 25 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1914.*

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas W. Griffith, Nineteenth Infantry, to be colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Col. Lea Febiger, Sixth Infantry, retired from active service March 2, 1914.

Maj. Almon L. Parmerter, Infantry, unassigned, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. Thomas W. Griffith, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Maj. Samuel E. Smiley, Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from March 3, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. Jacob F. Kreps, Infantry, unassigned, retired from active service March 2, 1914.

Capt. William H. Simons, Sixth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1914, vice Maj. Almon L. Parmerter, unassigned, promoted.

Capt. John F. Madden, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be major from March 3, 1914, vice Maj. Samuel E. Smiley, Twenty-fourth Infantry, promoted.

First Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson, Twentieth Infantry, to be captain from March 3, 1914, vice Capt. William H. Simons, Sixth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Hatie, Twenty-fifth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from March 3, 1914, vice First Lieut. Bertram P. Johnson, Twentieth Infantry, promoted.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

*To be first lieutenants with rank from March 3, 1914.*

Morris Fishbein, of Illinois.

Benjamin Hobson Frayser, of Virginia.

Edward Sutton Gooch, of Oklahoma.

William Henry Huntington, of the District of Columbia.

Hugh Farber McGaughey, of Minnesota.

Ashley Baker Morrill, of Illinois.

Charles Benjamin Palmer, of Arizona.



Leo Francis Schiff, of New York.  
Charles Mason Smith, of Virginia.  
Herbert Edward Wheeler, of Washington.  
Reinhard Ernst Wobus, of Missouri.

#### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Col. John A. Lejeune to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Maj. Wendell C. Neville to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Capt. Harry Lee to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of February, 1914.

Boatswain Niels A. Johnsen to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1914.

Boatswain Isidor Nordstrom to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 3d day of February, 1914.

Albert L. Bass, a citizen of Kentucky, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 27th day of February, 1914.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALABAMA.

Lewis J. Lawson to be postmaster at Greensboro, Ala., in place of Lewis J. Lawson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1913.

##### ARIZONA.

Bertha M. Rees to be postmaster at Wickenburg, Ariz., in place of John Witherley, resigned.

##### CALIFORNIA.

C. H. Francis to be postmaster at Loomis, Cal., in place of Frederick W. Turner. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. R. Gore to be postmaster at Fair Oaks, Cal., in place of Leonard M. Shelton. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

R. C. Hannan to be postmaster at Corning, Cal., in place of M. H. Chittenden. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Virgil W. Norton to be postmaster at Sutter Creek, Cal., in place of Frank J. Payne. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

W. A. Rice to be postmaster at Saratoga, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

Hiram A. Rudd to be postmaster at Walnut Creek, Cal. Office became presidential July 1, 1913.

David C. Simpson to be postmaster at Courtland, Cal., in place of Charles E. Bauer, resigned.

Will Smith to be postmaster at Soldiers' Home, Cal., in place of Duncan A. Gray, removed.

Edwin L. Story to be postmaster at Anderson, Cal., in place of W. S. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Frank C. Thompson to be postmaster at Garden Grove, Cal. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. N. Tibessart to be postmaster at Orland, Cal., in place of Clyde L. De Armond. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1913.

J. W. Townes to be postmaster at Pinole, Cal., in place of Edward M. Downer, resigned.

M. S. Trigueiro to be postmaster at San Miguel, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

J. D. Wagon to be postmaster at Sonoma, Cal., in place of John M. Cheney. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1913.

##### COLORADO.

L. D. Conant to be postmaster at Monte Vista, Colo., in place of George B. Boutwell. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

##### FLORIDA.

F. M. Brown to be postmaster at Miami, Fla., in place of Morgan E. Jones, removed.

Robert O. Cresap to be postmaster at Lakeland, Fla., in place of Joseph L. Skipper, resigned.

William D. Sanford to be postmaster at Coconut Grove, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

##### HAWAII.

M. K. Keohokalole to be postmaster at Paia, Hawaii, in place of David C. Lindsay, removed.

##### IDAHO.

J. J. Caldwell to be postmaster at Meridian, Idaho, in place of Samuel M. C. Reynolds. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

W. A. Criswell to be postmaster at Mackay, Idaho, in place of George L. Morgan, resigned.

W. B. Stone to be postmaster at Driggs, Idaho. Office became presidential October 1, 1913.

##### ILLINOIS.

William Baskerville to be postmaster at Coal City, Ill., in place of Hugh Bennett, resigned.

M. L. Briscoe to be postmaster at Westfield, Ill., in place of John Biggs. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Gustav L. Burmeister to be postmaster at Elmhurst, Ill., in place of Otto W. Balgemann. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

M. B. Dolan to be postmaster at Durand, Ill., in place of Lillian J. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

James N. Hall to be postmaster at Delavan, Ill., in place of William F. Hodson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

E. P. Hectorme to be postmaster at Avon, Ill., in place of Arthur Merrill. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Fred H. Henckler to be postmaster at Columbia, Ill., in place of Joseph M. Arnin. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Arthur F. Hiland to be postmaster at De Kalb, Ill., in place of Martin A. L. Olsen. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1914.

George Hoffman to be postmaster at Crete, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Joseph Kramer to be postmaster at West Chicago, Ill., in place of John H. Creager. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Thomas Mercer to be postmaster at Sandwich, Ill., in place of Edward F. Ledoyt. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Joseph A. Roesler to be postmaster at Ashton, Ill., in place of Harlow E. Chadwick. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

David Schein to be postmaster at Waterloo, Ill., in place of Henry Schneider. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

John L. Schmidt to be postmaster at Hinckley, Ill., in place of William G. Baile. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1914.

Henry Stahle to be postmaster at Plano, Ill., in place of George S. Faxon. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Louis A. Stoll to be postmaster at Aurora, Ill., in place of Louis A. Constantine. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charles E. Wescott to be postmaster at Sheffield, Ill., in place of Charles A. Simington. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

William Vollbracht to be postmaster at Camp Point, Ill., in place of Maggie Kay. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Bert C. White to be postmaster at Downers Grove, Ill., in place of Elbert C. Stanley. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Charles M. Wright to be postmaster at Gilman, Ill., in place of Michael O'Neill, resigned.

##### INDIANA.

William H. Beaty to be postmaster at Worthington, Ind., in place of George D. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Curtis Butler to be postmaster at Oakland City, Ind., in place of James H. Cockrum. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

R. Philip Carpenter to be postmaster at Noblesville, Ind., in place of John Owen. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

John J. Cleary to be postmaster at Terre Haute, Ind., in place of Thatcher A. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Joseph P. Cummins to be postmaster at Middletown, Ind., in place of Joseph A. Young. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Frank W. Dalton to be postmaster at Plainfield, Ind., in place of Taylor Reagan. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

George E. Erdmann to be postmaster at Greensburg, Ind., in place of Bert Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Franklin M. Field to be postmaster at Spencer, Ind., in place of Lyman D. Heavenridge. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

Allen P. Green to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ind., in place of Elisha Sexton. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Benjamin F. Hoopingarner to be postmaster at Syracuse, Ind., in place of Joseph H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

William A. King to be postmaster at Danville, Ind., in place of Charles P. Hornaday. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

John B. Lawler to be postmaster at Madison, Ind., in place of Marcus R. Sulzer. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Dennis O'Riley to be postmaster at Remington, Ind., in place of William E. Peck. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

John R. Paine to be postmaster at Clinton, Ind., in place of John O. Stark. Incumbent's commission expires March 25, 1914.

Frank J. Retterath to be postmaster at Goodland, Ind., in place of Alvin J. Kitt. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Charles H. Salm to be postmaster at Rockport, Ind., in place of Frank B. Garlinghouse. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Allen Swope to be postmaster at Seymour, Ind., in place of Edward A. Remy. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

## IOWA.

Clarence E. Brooks, to be postmaster at Brooklyn, Iowa, in place of Elmer E. Rayburn. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Albert H. Brous to be postmaster at Prairie City, Iowa, in place of Thomas W. Nickson. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Elizabeth Crowe to be postmaster at Clermont, Iowa. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

L. A. Dugan to be postmaster at Kingsley, Iowa, in place of John M. Wormley, removed.

Lee S. Edwards to be postmaster at Dunlap, Iowa, in place of B. J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

L. H. Flood to be postmaster at Carson, Iowa, in place of James T. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1914.

Isaac Fouch to be postmaster at Monroe, Iowa, in place of Henry A. Perrin. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

John McC. Gass to be postmaster at Albia, Iowa, in place of George L. Robb. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

George H. Helscher to be postmaster at Keota, Iowa, in place of Lauren E. Hulse. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

William H. Keough to be postmaster at Lehigh, Iowa, in place of Hal C. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1913.

Martin C. Nelsen to be postmaster at Spirit Lake, Iowa, in place of George W. Stapleton. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Elmer A. McIlree to be postmaster at West Union, Iowa, in place of Charles F. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Thomas A. Massie to be postmaster at Logan, Iowa, in place of James H. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1914.

Frank Thompson to be postmaster at Cambridge, Iowa, in place of James A. McKee, resigned.

## KANSAS.

Adelaide Brandenburg to be postmaster at Frankfort, Kans., in place of John M. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1914.

J. P. Fern to be postmaster at Scammon, Kans., in place of Thomas B. Evans, deceased.

E. S. Irwin to be postmaster at Liberal, Kans., in place of John N. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

Hugh N. Jones to be postmaster at Lebo, Kans., in place of James E. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires April 13, 1914.

R. C. Logan to be postmaster at Smith Center, Kans., in place of D. B. Dyer, resigned.

James E. Miller to be postmaster at Walnut, Kans., in place of William H. May. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

John L. Paden to be postmaster at Fowler, Kans., in place of I. J. Stanton, resigned.

J. H. Plummer to be postmaster at Westmoreland, Kans., in place of Lair D. Hart. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Harry Spurrier to be postmaster at Kiowa, Kans., in place of Harry E. Glenn. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Richard E. Thoes to be postmaster at Alma, Kans., in place of Clinton O. Kinne. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Bowles Unsell to be postmaster at Caldwell, Kans., in place of John W. Nyce. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

## KENTUCKY.

Francis E. Bradley to be postmaster at Scottsville, Ky., in place of M. B. Dixon, removed.

Mary McR. Bruce to be postmaster at Stanford, Ky., in place of James C. Florence. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

R. A. Field to be postmaster at Catlettsburg, Ky., in place of William C. Harper. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Harry H. Grobmyer to be postmaster at Carrollton, Ky., in place of Harry N. Stringfellow. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

E. W. Hackney to be postmaster at London, Ky., in place of A. R. Dyche, removed.

R. K. McCarney to be postmaster at Paris, Ky., in place of N. A. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

John O'Reilly to be postmaster at Hardinsburg, Ky., in place of W. Sherman Ball, removed.

Spalding Trafton to be postmaster at Henderson, Ky., in place of William H. Overby. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

## LOUISIANA.

Lillian D. Richardson to be postmaster at Independence, La., in place of Lillian D. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired January 20, 1914.

## MAINE.

Edgar M. Frisbee to be postmaster at Kittery Point, Me., in place of Frank T. Clarkson, deceased.

Patrick F. Welch to be postmaster at Calais, Me., in place of George Downes. Incumbent's commission expires April 1, 1914.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

James M. Hurley to be postmaster at Marlboro, Mass., in place of John S. Fay, deceased.

J. J. Harrington to be postmaster at Chester, Mass., in place of James W. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1913.

James Kinsley to be postmaster at West Acton, Mass., in place of Charles H. Mead. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

## MICHIGAN.

M. R. Bradley to be postmaster at Hermansville, Mich., in place of Edwin P. Radford, resigned.

Edgar E. Bedell to be postmaster at Bellaire, Mich., in place of Samuel Adams. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

George L. Belcher to be postmaster at Leslie, Mich., in place of George W. Dennis. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Samuel D. Bonner to be postmaster at Newaygo, Mich., in place of Louis Larson. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Ernest J. Dubé to be postmaster at Houghton, Mich., in place of Richard B. Lang. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Thomas G. Finucan to be postmaster at Charlevoix, Mich., in place of Arthur L. Fitch. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Andrew B. Goodwin, to be postmaster at Carson City, Mich., in place of Charles R. Culver. Incumbent's commission expires March 31, 1914.

Michael Hoban to be postmaster at St. Ignace, Mich., in place of Frederick Kruger. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

James L. Klett to be postmaster at Whitehall, Mich., in place of Edward D. Skeels. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Charles F. Parker to be postmaster at Middleville, Mich., in place of Richard M. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Jacob C. Rough to be postmaster at Buchanan, Mich., in place of Albert A. Worthington. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.



John E. Shekell to be postmaster at Jackson, Mich., in place of Josiah C. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Christopher Lowney to be postmaster at Laurium, Mich., in place of Vincent Vairo. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

## MINNESOTA.

Edward A. Buckley to be postmaster at East Grand Forks, Minn., in place of Ole A. Thoreson. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

George G. Stone to be postmaster at Pipestone, Minn., in place of J. H. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires March 14, 1914.

## MISSOURI.

William Arterburn to be postmaster at Carrollton, Mo., in place of Lewis A. Scott. Incumbent's commission expires March 10, 1914.

Adolph B. Bertram to be postmaster at Rockport, Mo., in place of William R. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

Hugh J. Bowen to be postmaster at South St. Joseph, Mo., in place of Abel F. Daily, deceased.

B. C. Drummond to be postmaster at Lexington, Mo., in place of John K. Taubman, resigned.

Edgar J. Geisinger to be postmaster at Unionville, Mo., in place of Clarence Conger. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

Benjamin F. Hackney to be postmaster at Carthage, Mo., in place of Robert T. Stickney. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

William H. Hambaugh to be postmaster at Craig, Mo., in place of F. K. Allen, resigned.

W. A. Kirkpatrick to be postmaster at Joplin, Mo., in place of Luther McGehee. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Alfred T. Lacey to be postmaster at Fredericktown, Mo., in place of Ezekiel A. Sample. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

Dudley A. Reid to be postmaster at Gilman City, Mo., in place of Ivan S. Goodwin, resigned.

James E. Sater to be postmaster at Monett, Mo., in place of Samuel A. Chappell. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

John K. Scott to be postmaster at Golden City, Mo., in place of Mordecai Bell. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

James Todd to be postmaster at Maryville, Mo., in place of Scribner R. Beach. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

Charles L. Wilson to be postmaster at Sarcoxie, Mo., in place of J. T. Burden. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

## MONTANA.

Thomas Gibb to be postmaster at Miles City, Mont., in place of John S. Towers. Incumbent's commission expires April 5, 1914.

Joseph E. Pickens to be postmaster at Huntley, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. H. Rutter to be postmaster at Hinsdale, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

## MISSISSIPPI.

Newton D. Goodwin to be postmaster at Gulfport, Miss., in place of Thomas W. Wadlow, deceased.

Mrs. Lallie H. Humphreys to be postmaster at Greenwood, Miss., in place of W. C. Peel. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

## NEBRASKA.

Andrew J. Caldwell to be postmaster at Walthill, Nebr., in place of Cecil R. Boughn, resigned.

Fred H. Davis to be postmaster at Madison, Nebr., in place of Jehiel H. Secor. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

Gustav A. Koza to be postmaster at Clarkson, Nebr., in place of Joseph Krahulik. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

W. C. Tredway to be postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Nebr., in place of Dennis Tracy. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

## NEVADA.

R. W. Gale to be postmaster at Gardnersville, Nev., in place of H. A. N. Todd, declined.

John P. Reynolds to be postmaster at Sparks, Nev., in place of Charles A. Beemer. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

Fred L. White to be postmaster at Reno, Nev., in place of Dwight A. Dawson. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

Benjamin Rosenthal to be postmaster at Goldfield, Nev., in place of Edward R. Collins, removed.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Edrick S. Avery to be postmaster at Franklin, N. H., in place of Ellsworth F. Pike. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

George B. Cavis to be postmaster at Bristol, N. H., in place of Fred H. Ackerman. Incumbent's commission expires April 20, 1914.

John L. Fulton to be postmaster at West Lebanon, N. H., in place of Horace French. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Benjamin C. Garland to be postmaster at Whitefield, N. H., in place of George L. Crockett. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

Arthur D. Sloan to be postmaster at Enfield, N. H., in place of Frank B. Williams. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

## NEW JERSEY.

George H. Abel to be postmaster at Haddon Heights, N. J., in place of George E. Schenck, resigned.

Henry Bell to be postmaster at Ramsey, N. J., in place of William H. Pulis. Incumbent's commission expires April 7, 1914.

Leo M. Danerhirsh to be postmaster at Woodbine, N. J., in place of Jacob Feldman. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1914.

William H. Eicks to be postmaster at Leonia, N. J., in place of Philip P. Cluss, removed.

George N. Harris to be postmaster at Newton, N. J., in place of James E. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

Cyrus B. Honce to be postmaster at Belmar, N. J., in place of William M. Bergen. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1913.

E. Furman Hooper to be postmaster at Trenton, N. J., in place of Alexander C. Yard. Incumbent's commission expires March 28, 1914.

Peter Latourette to be postmaster at White House Station, N. J., in place of William C. Swackhamer. Incumbent's commission expires April 28, 1914.

Benjamin F. Smith to be postmaster at Ocean City, N. J., in place of Edward M. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

Edward C. Wheaton to be postmaster at Cape May Court-house, N. J., in place of Horace E. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

## NEW MEXICO.

Ervin E. Brunk to be postmaster at Dexter, N. Mex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

John M. Clark to be postmaster at Dawson, N. Mex., in place of George L. Bradford, resigned.

Henry C. Roehl to be postmaster at Albuquerque, N. Mex., in place of Robert W. Hopkins, resigned.

Leopoldo Sanchez to be postmaster at Santa Rosa, N. Mex., in place of Bonifacio Lucero, removed.

## NEW YORK.

Henry S. Sutherland to be postmaster at White Plains, N. Y., in place of James K. Cowan, resigned.

Charles M. Estell to be postmaster at Friendship, N. Y., in place of Frank R. Utter, removed.

Sumner I. Houghwout to be postmaster at Falconer, N. Y., in place of Emil A. Peterson, resigned.

William E. Kelly to be postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y., in place of Edmund W. Voorhies, resigned.

Claud M. Armitage to be postmaster at Caudor, N. Y., in place of James H. Jennings. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

William A. Cochran to be postmaster at Southold, N. Y., in place of Moses T. Horton. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Thomas Connors to be postmaster at Camillus, N. Y., in place of Owen E. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expires March 17, 1914.

George D. Cunningham to be postmaster at Schaghticoke, N. Y., in place of Fred M. Askins. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

Joseph E. Downs to be postmaster at Islip, N. Y., in place of Edgar S. Cloch. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

Herbert W. Rackett to be postmaster at Greenvort, N. Y., in place of Joseph Ogle. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

H. S. Ransom to be postmaster at Ransomville, N. Y., in place of George F. Monahan. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Robert E. L. Reynolds to be postmaster at Amsterdam, N. Y., in place of Thomas Liddle. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1913.

Verne Seeber to be postmaster at South Dayton, N. Y., in place of Nathan L. Rowe. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Lee Van Vredenburg to be postmaster at Rhinebeck, N. Y., in place of Charles E. McCarty. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

John E. Walker to be postmaster at Philmont, N. Y., in place of Dean Best. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Samuel N. Wheeler to be postmaster at Hancock, N. Y., in place of George Realy. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

#### NORTH CAROLINA.

Lula F. Bland to be postmaster at Pittsboro, N. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William C. Blanton to be postmaster at Forest City, N. C., in place of M. M. McCurry. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1914.

Samuel Y. Bryson to be postmaster at Hendersonville, N. C., in place of Brownlow Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Luther B. Carr to be postmaster at Wallace, N. C., in place of Robert B. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

John K. Cline to be postmaster at Lincolnton, N. C., in place of D. L. Yount. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

Hamilton Erwin to be postmaster at Morganton, N. C., in place of Charles F. McKesson. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

Owen Gudger to be postmaster at Asheville, N. C., in place of Wallace W. Rollins. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

Vernon G. Pleasants to be postmaster at Rowland, N. C., in place of Hayes S. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires March 24, 1914.

W. D. Templeton to be postmaster at Mooresville, N. C., in place of Alonzo C. Kerby. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

E. S. Yarbrough to be postmaster at Duke, N. C., in place of Felix M. Kay. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1914.

#### NORTH DAKOTA.

John H. Bloom to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of Richard Daeley. Incumbent's commission expires March 11, 1914.

Joseph G. Senger to be postmaster at Harvey, N. Dak., in place of Chester A. Revell. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Robert E. Wessel to be postmaster at Oakes, N. Dak., in place of William H. Bush. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

#### OHIO.

Richard D. Brown to be postmaster at Pataskala, Ohio, in place of Clarence C. Fravel. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

John T. Flynn to be postmaster at Bellaire, Ohio, in place of Orlando P. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

Charles L. Hunter to be postmaster at St. Marys, Ohio, in place of John A. Anderson, resigned.

Orrin E. Jones to be postmaster at West Salem, Ohio, in place of W. W. Garver. Incumbent's commission expires March 15, 1914.

Joseph L. Riesser to be postmaster at Ripley, Ohio, in place of Sarah E. Maddox. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

Philip Wetzel to be postmaster at Perrysburg, Ohio, in place of Fred Yeager. Incumbent's commission expires March 15, 1914.

#### OKLAHOMA.

M. E. Dillake to be postmaster at Quinton, Okla., in place of Maud C. White, resigned.

Laura Houston to be postmaster at Woodward, Okla., in place of Sherman M. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1914.

James W. Smith to be postmaster at Grandfield, Okla., in place of Andrew D. Chapman. Incumbent's commission expires March 10, 1914.

W. J. Strange to be postmaster at Chelsea, Okla., in place of J. R. Sequichie, resigned.

#### OREGON.

Paul C. Belt to be postmaster at Willamina, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

M. M. Fitch to be postmaster at Sherwood, Oreg., in place of Lawrence S. McConnell. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1914.

C. W. Holloman to be postmaster at Haines, Oreg. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Victor P. Moses to be postmaster at Corvallis, Oreg., in place of Burtis W. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1914.

Archie Parker to be postmaster at Monmouth, Oreg., in place of O. A. Wolverton. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

Russell H. Sullens to be postmaster at Prairie City, Oreg., in place of D. B. Davidson, resigned.

J. H. Young to be postmaster at Hermiston, Oreg., in place of John H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

#### PENNSYLVANIA.

David Burke to be postmaster at Bangor, Pa., in place of R. F. Schaeffer, resigned.

Thomas N. Burke to be postmaster at Mount Carmel, Pa., in place of Thomas R. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1914.

John A. Coonahan to be postmaster at Ogontz, Pa., in place of William H. Michener. Incumbent's commission expires March 30, 1914.

Charles S. Duncan to be postmaster at Gettysburg, Pa., in place of C. W. Beales. Incumbent's commission expired March 5, 1914.

Simon P. Geisel to be postmaster at Hooversville, Pa., in place of Fred G. Fryburg. Incumbent's commission expired February 24, 1914.

John K. Gorman to be postmaster at Coalport, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Alonzo W. Jones to be postmaster at Mount Union, Pa., in place of I. Newton Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires March 7, 1914.

W. R. Speer to be postmaster at Everett, Pa., in place of John C. Chamberlain. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1914.

Annie H. Washburn to be postmaster at Wyncote, Pa., in place of Annie H. Washburn. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1914.

#### PORTO RICO.

Fernando Callejo to be postmaster at Manati, P. R., in place of Fernando Callejo. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

Manuel S. Pacheco to be postmaster at Fajardo, P. R., in place of Manuel S. Pacheco. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1913.

#### RHODE ISLAND.

Alonzo A. Greenman to be postmaster at Kingston, R. I. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

Daniel G. Coggeshall to be postmaster at Bristol, R. I., in place of Edward J. Prest. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1914.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA.

N. C. Andrews to be postmaster at Irene, S. Dak. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

William S. Small to be postmaster at Gettysburg, S. Dak., in place of William Toomey, resigned.

#### TENNESSEE.

M. B. Capps to be postmaster at Livingston, Tenn., in place of Timothy F. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1914.

I. S. Davidson to be postmaster at Petersburg, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

W. H. Howard to be postmaster at Milan, Tenn., in place of A. D. Holt. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

#### TEXAS.

Clinton Bybee to be postmaster at Willis, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.



Thomas W. Cain to be postmaster at Bastrop, Tex., in place of George Realy. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

F. W. Easterwood to be postmaster at Hearne, Tex., in place of C. J. Hostrasser. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

F. P. Henry to be postmaster at Floydada, Tex., in place of Jesse D. Starks. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Archie N. Justiss to be postmaster at Corsicana, Tex., in place of H. E. Kinsloe. Incumbent's commission expired February 7, 1914.

Frank Leverton to be postmaster at Grapeland, Tex., in place of Benjamin F. Hill, resigned.

Maxey McCrary to be postmaster at Calvert, Tex., in place of James A. Gammill. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

A. L. Melton to be postmaster at Leonard, Tex., in place of Robert C. May, resigned.

Fred R. Ridley to be postmaster at Campbell, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

J. J. Sutton to be postmaster at Stockdale, Tex., in place of Mary A. Haskell. Incumbent's commission expires March 18, 1914.

Arthur T. Terrell to be postmaster at Eagle Pass, Tex., in place of George W. Rohleder, declined.

J. D. Williams to be postmaster at Sinton, Tex., in place of Waldo E. Haisley. Incumbent's commission expired February 8, 1914.

Joe Wren to be postmaster at Normangee, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

#### UTAH.

Noble Warrum to be postmaster at Salt Lake City, Utah, in place of Arthur L. Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

#### VERMONT.

Henry D. Allen to be postmaster at Wilmington, Vt., in place of Orrin H. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

Cornelius Buckley to be postmaster at Barton, Vt., in place of C. B. Webster. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

#### WASHINGTON.

George H. Bevan to be postmaster at Kettle Falls, Wash., in place of R. A. McKellar. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1914.

Andrew Hunter to be postmaster at Issaquah, Wash. Office became presidential January 1, 1914.

F. H. McCroskey to be postmaster at Sprague, Wash., in place of W. A. Buckley. Incumbent's commission expires March 8, 1914.

Charles A. Ramm to be postmaster at Davenport, Wash., in place of Jacob F. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1914.

T. T. Richardson to be postmaster at Northport, Wash., in place of William F. Case. Incumbent's commission expired February 2, 1914.

R. A. Turner to be postmaster at Ellensburg, Wash., in place of Oliver Hinman. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

F. L. Whitney to be postmaster at Ferndale, Wash., in place of Minor McLain, removed.

#### WEST VIRGINIA.

Benjamin L. Brown to be postmaster at Kingwood, W. Va., in place of H. S. Whetsell, removed.

W. W. Johnson to be postmaster at Glenville, W. Va., in place of John S. Brannon. Incumbent's commission expired January 24, 1914.

William G. Keyes to be postmaster at Philippi, W. Va., in place of William A. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

William L. Reinhart to be postmaster at Shepherdstown, W. Va., in place of Harry E. Munday. Incumbent's commission expired February 3, 1914.

Burton B. Rohrbough to be postmaster at Belington, W. Va., in place of J. W. Criss. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1914.

#### WISCONSIN.

J. D. O'Brien to be postmaster at Randolph, Wis., in place of Hugh H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Jeremiah J. Cunningham to be postmaster at Janesville, Wis., in place of Charles L. Valentine. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

Samuel P. Godfrey to be postmaster at Waupaca, Wis., in place of A. M. Penny, resigned.

Edward Schroeder to be postmaster at Granton, Wis., in place of John M. Tompkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1914.

James C. Thomas to be postmaster at Poynette, Wis., in place of P. W. Mackenzie. Incumbent's commission expired February 22, 1914.

#### WYOMING.

James B. Delaney to be postmaster at Saratoga, Wyo., in place of Joseph Munz, resigned.

A. N. Hasenkamp to be postmaster at Laramie, Wyo., in place of Elmer T. Beltz. Incumbent's commission expires March 16, 1914.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1914.*

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALABAMA.

Lewis J. Lawson, Greensboro.

##### CONNECTICUT.

Hugh W. Cronin, Torrington.

##### IOWA.

Robert C. Plummer, Forest City.

##### NEW YORK.

William E. Kelley, Brooklyn.

##### OHIO.

John M. Francis, Cadiz.

##### UTAH.

William W. Le Cheminant, Garfield.

##### WEST VIRGINIA.

Maurice E. Wentzell, Harpers Ferry.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

*FRIDAY, March 6, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the wisdom which gave us the adage, "Trust in God, but keep your powder dry," which is not only good philosophy, good sense, but good religion. May we trust in Thee and keep a clear head; trust in Thee and keep a clean heart; trust in Thee and be diligent; trust in Thee and do our duty; trust in Thee and be coworkers together with Thee in the establishment of Thy kingdom upon the earth under the spiritual leadership of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. **POU** and Mr. **LEVER** rose.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. **LEVER**. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand that the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized, and my motion is pending. But if he is recognized, I make the point of order that his motion is not in order, and upon that I ask to be heard for a very few minutes.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will hear the gentleman. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that if the House desires to go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, this is a day which belongs to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. **POU**. Upon that point I would like to be heard, also. I respectfully differ with the Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair stated that by way of suggestion.

Mr. **LEVER**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is not claims day or war-claims day.

Mr. **POU**. I wish to address myself briefly, Mr. Speaker, to this question. Of course I know what the custom of the House

has been with respect to this day. In the first place, I submit that this Friday is not the day for the consideration of bills reported by the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. How does the gentleman make that out?

Mr. POUL. I was about to state. For this reason: On the third Friday in the last month the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar, giving preference to bills from the Committee on Claims. After the third Friday came the fourth Friday, which, of course, belongs to pensions. Then came the fifth Friday, and under this rule that belonged to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. There were only four Fridays in February.

Mr. POUL. The Speaker is right, there was not a fifth Friday in the last month; but I know that this is true: There has been a Friday since the Committee on Claims was given consideration by the House, to which the Committee on War Claims was entitled, because I talked with the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG], and he said that he expected to get a part of the day. That being the case, this is the alternative Friday which would belong to the Committee on Claims, provided the House agreed to this motion.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Claims had the last Friday.

Mr. POUL. No; the last Friday, barring the second and fourth, belonged to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The last Friday that we considered claims the Committee on Claims had it.

Mr. POUL. That is true; but there has been since then a Friday which properly belonged, under the rules, to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman if in such a case as occurred then and the House took Friday away from the Claims Committee, if that is not practically no Friday at all?

Mr. POUL. No; I think not. I think this rule contemplates that one Friday shall belong to the Committee on Claims and the next to the Committee on War Claims. I do not think the rule means that if the Claims Committee gets in on a certain day that then the Claims Committee must be shut out until the Committee on War Claims has an opportunity to have its bills considered. It is my duty to be here to do all I can to secure consideration of bills from the committee of which I am chairman. It is the duty of the chairman of the Committee on War Claims to be present on the Friday to which his committee is entitled and have his bills considered. This, I understand, he attempted.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on War Claims was here and doing all he could to get in, except that he did not make the motion on the floor. He came to the Chair and asked about it, and the Chair told him he was going to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider appropriation bills, and would not recognize him, but the Chair would recognize him to-day if he was here, unless the House went into Committee of the Whole House on appropriation bills.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, in any event, I make the point of order that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is not in order. If this rule means anything, it means that Friday of each week, barring the second and fourth, shall be set apart for consideration of certain business. It seems to me that in view of the plain reading of this rule the Speaker should hold that the preferential motion should come from the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims. The rule says:

On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar—

And so forth.

The rule says plainly that on a certain day the House shall give preference to certain business. This rule does not mean that the Committee on War Claims or the Committee on Claims or the Committee on Pensions can be shut out at will by the chairman of some great committee. If the rule meant that, the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Claims, the Committee on Pensions had better go in advance and appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairmen of the other great committees and ask them whether it is their sweet will that we shall have an opportunity to get in on these particular days. I say that if the rule means anything at all, it means that on these particular days the Committee on War Claims, the Committee on Claims, and the Committee on Pensions shall have the preferential right to make the motion to go into Committee of the Whole. The Committee on Claims has 35 bills on this calendar. We have probably 15 other bills

ready to be placed on the calendar. What is to become of them? I think I know, if this sort of procedure is maintained. We will have a rule brought in probably giving some night to the consideration of these bills. Then what is going to happen? Whatever we can get through by unanimous consent will go through, and bills to which any Member objects will not go through, and we will be subject to the will of anyone who wants to make the point of no quorum.

I believe that the membership of this House wants these committees to have consideration for bills reported by them on the days set apart by this rule, and I do not believe that under a proper construction of the rule the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is in order. On every day set apart, under the rule, for consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Claims I am going to be here and do what I can under the rules to secure consideration of these measures. The membership of this House that voted for this rule, the committee that framed the rule, did not intend that a set of men should be working diligently day after day to put bills on the calendar and then see the result of all their labor nullified at the sweet will of some gentleman who happens to be at the head of one of these great appropriation committees. If this rule has been so construed in the past, I maintain that the time has come to change it, and there is no better time to do that than right here and now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, clause 6 of Rule XXIV, to which the gentleman refers, provides:

On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar in the following order:

The gentleman insists that this shuts out the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but clause 9 of Rule XVI provides:

At any time after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue or general appropriation bills.

So that both motions are in order. The fact that the Private Calendar is in order on Friday does not shut out the other rule. The other motion is also in order. The rules have been frequently construed, and this memorandum follows the Private Calendar rule:

This rule does not interfere with the highly privileged motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider revenue or appropriation bills, which may be made immediately after the reading of the Journal on Fridays as on other days, and at any time of the day has precedence of the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the Private Calendar.

I think that disposes of the gentleman's contention as to his point of order that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is not in order.

If we should go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, the gentleman from North Carolina insists that the claims bills would have precedence. The last day that was devoted to the Private Calendar outside of pensions was devoted to claims. The rule provides that except on the second and fourth Fridays the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees; and the gentleman from North Carolina claims that this means alternating Fridays, although that is not the language of the rule. This rule has been frequently construed, and the memorandum or note made by the parliamentarian under the rule provides:

When the House, by special order, devotes Friday entirely to business other than private business the special rules governing the use of the day are thereby suspended.

The alternating is between the committees and not between the Fridays. As a matter of fact, at this session of Congress war claims has had no day whatever. We considered the war-claims bill on claims day, because while the Claims Committee took precedence on that day it had no bills on the calendar. That was the first Friday of this session of Congress, December 5. The House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, and the Claims Committee came first. It took precedence, but having no bills on the calendar we proceeded with the consideration of the omnibus war claims bill, but that day, theoretically, was devoted to the Committee on Claims which had precedence. Subsequently we have taken up again the Claims Calendar, considering by general consent. I take it, that the war claims having actually called up a bill on a day devoted to the Claims Committee it should be so treated. But the Committee on Claims in any event under no construction



of the rule would be entitled to this day as against the War Claims Committee.

Mr. LEVER rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not care to hear further argument on these points of order. The Chair is prepared to rule. There is not a more vigilant Member of the House than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW]. [Applause.] He attends to his business, and he is always on hand when the time is propitious, and sometimes when it is not propitious, to get up his bills. But this is the parliamentary situation: In the first place, some of these rules need recasting to make them harmonious with each other. For instance, one rule provides that a report from the Committee on Rules is always in order, while the rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] quoted, section 9 of Rule XVI, provides that at any time after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order, by direction of the appropriate committees, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering bills raising revenue or general appropriation bills. At first blush it would seem that those rules were in direct conflict with each other, and in one sense they are.

Suppose the chairman of the Committee on Rules were here demanding recognition to bring in a rule and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] were insisting on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to discuss the Agricultural appropriation bill, what would happen? All of these rules must be considered together, to make, if possible, a consistent whole, and they must be considered in the light of common sense. In addition to that, the Speaker is under moral obligation to construe them so as to expedite the business of the House. There are 14 general appropriation bills. The Government can not exist unless the Committees on Appropriations in Congress, under its leaders, perform their functions, and it is the business of the Speaker to expedite the passage of these bills where he can under the rules so that we may be able to get away from here before the frost comes.

Originally private claims did not have any more standing than any other bills, but had to come up under the usual procedure. Finally, the House determined to set aside certain Fridays in order that preference might be given to consideration of claims bills over the ordinary run of business; but that was not to give consideration of those matters preference over a motion of an Appropriation Committee that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering an appropriation bill, which is of the highest importance.

It has been ruled on—and the Chair wants to settle this thing for all time to come if he can—by three different Speakers; that is, by two Speakers and one Speaker pro tempore—Speaker Reed, Speaker Henderson, and the Hon. John Dalzell, Speaker pro tempore. Now, here is Mr. Speaker Reed's ruling (Hinds' Precedents, volume 4, section 3082):

The motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider general appropriation bills has precedence on a Friday of a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar. On Friday, February 4, 1898, Mr. James A. Hemenway, of Indiana, from the Committee on Appropriations, moved that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a general appropriation bill. Mr. Joseph W. Bailey, of Texas, made the point that the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider business on the Private Calendar was of higher privilege than the motion made by Mr. Hemenway. The Speaker said that it had been the invariable construction of the rule that public business had the right of way.

Now, that is the crux of the whole thing. Continuing, Speaker Reed said:

If the House did not desire to consider appropriation bills, it could vote down the motion of the gentleman from Indiana, and then the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Private Calendar would be next in order.

The other two decisions are to the same effect.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider a general appropriation bill.

Now, the House has its remedy. It can do as it pleases. I will give an illustration. A couple of years ago the gentleman from New York, Mr. Sulzer, reported the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, and about five minutes after that Capt. Lamb, of Virginia, reported the Agricultural appropriation bill, and the gentleman from New York was very solicitous to get in first, and he came in the Speaker's room and asked me to recognize him. I said to him, "They will not consider your bill; they will consider the Agricultural bill." He wanted to be recognized anyhow. I said, "They will vote you down 10 to 1." So he was sitting where Judge Houston is, on a front seat, and made his motion and I recognized him. Capt. Lamb was back where the gentleman from South Carolina sits, motioning with his fingers, trying to make the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the Agricultural bill. I said we could not have two motions of that sort pending at once. He asked me what would be done if the motion of the gentleman from New York was voted down? I said I would recognize him to make his motion. They voted the gentleman from New York down, about 10 to 1, because there were at least 10 men in the House interested in the Agricultural bill to 1 interested in the Diplomatic and Consular bill. [Laughter.] So the House can always do as it pleases. Now, on the other point, about which one of these two committees on claims is entitled to this day, if the gentleman from South Carolina was not interfering, it would be the War Claims Committee. It is not Fridays, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested, that alternate, but the committees. The last time either one of these committees had a Friday it was the Committee on Claims, the committee of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW]; and, as I stated in an interlocutory way a little while ago, the chairman of the Committee on War Claims [Mr. GREGG] was here and was very anxious to get in, and asked me if I would recognize him, and I told him I would recognize the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. So next Friday, if the House sustains the Speaker in this matter, the Committee on War Claims will have the right of way unless a privileged matter is called up.

Mr. POW. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POW. Unless this rule is changed, why, the Committee on Pensions could be displaced if any chairman of one of the great appropriating committees made a motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House, just as the Committee on War Claims and the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Just exactly; no earthly difference between them.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will indulge me for a moment, I desire to say I have no wish to displace the Private Calendar to-day, except for the reason that all of us agree that we must pass these appropriation bills if we are to get away from this Congress at all, and hence my motion this morning.

Mr. POW. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he does not think it is an important matter to look after the pensions of the old soldiers, and does he not think claims are entitled to some consideration from the House also? Is not that public business also?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. If that condition arises and the House wants to consider pensions next Friday, or claims, it can say so.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13679, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to consume just a moment in my own time.

The coincidences of life are always interesting. Gentlemen of the committee will remember that on the morning of March 3 in opening my remarks I made this statement:

Mr. Chairman, at breakfast this morning I happened to overhear a remark made by one of those two-by-four know-it-alls which set me thinking. It was this: "No class of people in this country except the farmer and the criminal can get any money from the Federal Government for any purpose." Continuing, he said, "Do you know that there are appropriated \$50,000,000 a year for the farmers of this country?"

I was very much interested and amused this morning to receive a letter, which I desire to read to the committee, without including the name of the writer. It is as follows:

COSMOS CLUB,  
Washington, D. C.

Hon. A. F. LEVER, M. C., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On Tuesday morning, March 3, 1914, I had the (unconscious) privilege of breakfasting with you, neither of us at the time being aware of the fact.

Later in the same day upon casually straying into the House of Representatives I was somewhat astonished to hear resounding through the room your words, repeating some of mine, uttered, however, thoughtlessly:

"At breakfast this morning I happened to overhear a remark made by one of those two-by-four know-it-alls which set me thinking. It was



this: 'No class of people can get any money from the Government except the farmer and the criminal.' Continuing, he said: 'Do you know that there are appropriated every year for the farmers of this country?' etc. I commend, sir, to your attention the coincidence which allowed you to hear these words of mine, which, however 'grossly ignorant,' nevertheless 'set you thinking,' and my subsequent hearing of your own words of corrective statistics on the floor of the House.

I sincerely thank you for your remarks on my personal appearance, which is of small importance, but they did not coincide with the descriptive adjectives in your opening remarks. May I say that you estimated me wrongly; I am 2½ by 5½, not 2 by 4.

In some seriousness, my remark I believe reflects, at any rate, the well-founded opinion of millions of my class, that much of the money appropriated by the Congress is wasted. The appropriations are increasing, and so is the adverse opinion. We know little of the details of the disbursements, because few Congressmen make speeches as clearly explanatory as your own, but we do know of the useless, free-seed 'graft,' the abuse of the franking privilege, and many other similar extravagances, and unfortunately these cause more adverse comment than is offset by the real use of certain departments, as that of agriculture.

I ask your pardon for addressing you thus, but believe that you may find the recital of our little coincidence amusing, which it certainly was to me.

I commend to you again, in real earnest, the desirability of catering somewhat to us 'two-by-fours,' for we are legion in number, and really show signs of restlessness when we see you chaps in Congress spending our money too freely.

Very sincerely, yours,

MARCH 5, 1914.

He signs his name, and then adds this postscript:

I will be at the Shoreham until Saturday night, and if you desire to challenge me to a 'dewell,' or would honor me by lunching with me, I should be gratified. I assure you that you would be taking no more chance than I.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONNOLLY].

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the consideration of this bill accentuates the friendly interest of this Democratic House and its earnest disposition to cooperate with that great producing class represented by the farmer. [Applause.]

The years roll on and with them rolls up in impressive and gigantic volume the population of the United States. The ratio of increase in our consuming population has not been paralleled by our producing population. With the travel of time the volume of our manufactures grows in leaps and bounds, advancing as a most impressive chapter in the history of our exports. With this growth of industry comes an increase in population that bears down heavily upon the resources of our farmers. It is not a great strain upon the imagination to picture the coming conflict of a great consuming demand for food supply on the one hand and the struggling array of food producers upon the other. Therefore with a capacity for consumption on the one hand levying toll upon the agricultural resources of our country, which in some items show an actual decrease in production, it is but natural and obvious that this Democratic House should address itself most seriously to the problem of farm production.

In the time allotted to me I will touch but briefly upon a few of the methods by which we are lending our help and inclining our cooperation to the interests of the agricultural classes.

#### FARM DEMONSTRATION WORK.

In the matter of farm demonstration work the Department of Agriculture has in a limited way sent out experts frequently in cooperation with the counties interested to devise plans and in a multiplicity of methods to demonstrate to the actual tiller of the soil.

The results in this limited way have been of such a satisfactory and encouraging nature that the Agricultural Committee recently reported out what is known as the Lever extension bill (H. R. 7951) with absolute unanimity.

For a great many years the Government has appropriated funds for investigation, laboratories, experiments, and various kinds of research, with the result that from these different channels there has accumulated a great reservoir of most valuable knowledge, data, and results. The acquisition of these results was a great asset to the Nation, but the problem developed as to a method of tapping this reservoir of knowledge gleaned, passing it through channels that would finally place it on the land of the producer, the actual tiller of the soil. The statutes under which the Government has in the past developed this knowledge was the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887, the second Morrill Act of 1890, the Adams Act of 1906, and the Nelson amendment of 1907.

As a justification for the appropriation of Government funds along agricultural lines, you can look to the experience of Europe. Let us contemplate, for instance, the history of Denmark in its application of the results of research and experiment to the problems confronting the actual laborer in the field, and this retrospection is of peculiar advantage in the light of the

tendency in some of our great wheat-growing States that some years ago were producing 30 bushels to the acre and now have declined to about 13 bushels to the acre. Many years ago Denmark was at a very low ebb industrially, in its finances, in its commerce, and in its agriculture. The Danish people became thoroughly aroused and they studied their own conditions most seriously and came to a realization that the foundation of its fabric of prosperity was the soil, and so the nation began upon the fields and initiated agricultural schools and laid out agricultural extension work, but this did not suffice, and so the Government sent out throughout the land skilled experts and enlightened evangelists of the soil to lead the farmer from the wilderness. These experts lived with the laborer, studied the localities, conditions, the soil, and every agricultural problem, and in a concrete way met these problems by conclusive demonstrations. At the time the percentage of the urban population greatly overshadowed the rural population, but the result of this labor at the basis of national prosperity was a great boom in agriculture, and rising up and concomitant with it went finance, industry, and commerce. As an instance of success of the Danes, compare the average yield of wheat per acre in Denmark of 40 bushels, with soil centuries older than that of the United States and perhaps not so good originally, with the average yield of wheat in the United States of 14 bushels per acre. And contrast, also, the results in the ancient soil of Germany, with its average yield of 28 bushels to the acre; in England, with 32 bushels to the acre; in Belgium, 34 bushels to the acre.

I understand that at one time in Denmark the rural population amounted to only 15 per cent of the total, whereas to-day it is almost 90 per cent. To-day in America the call is to the country, and the Democratic Party harkens to the call. We wish to place before the country the benefits of science and research.

#### THE BOYS' AND GIRLS' CORN, POTATO, GARDEN, AND CANNING DEMONSTRATION CLUBS.

At this point let us establish a bench mark indicating the difference between ordinary husbandry and the application of science and demonstrated methods of successful farming by introducing the results of the boys' and girls' corn, potato, garden, and canning clubs. In the culture of corn we find that a 10-year average in the United States would show a rate of 25 bushels per acre, and yet last year one of the winners in the Alabama Boys' Corn Club showed a record of 232 bushels to the acre, and as an Iowan I was proud to note that the winner of the Boys' Corn Club of the Northern and Central States was Arthur Runft, of Reinbeck, Iowa, showing a yield of 138 bushels per acre, with a resultant profit of \$133.43, and in the recent visitation of the winners of these different clubs my gratification was further stimulated by the record in the cultivation of tomatoes by Miss Fridtall, of Cedar Falls, Iowa, my own district. Among the club she was first in the amount of profit and second in the volume of production, showing on the profit side over \$100 per acre, and a yield of 3,403 pounds. [Applause.]

Through research, laboratory, and experiments we have acquired knowledge of incalculable value to the farmer. For instance, in the matter of soil fertility the analysis, the physical and chemical survey of soils have developed typical instances of areas that seemed almost worthless, so thorough was the depletion, and it was found that one element lacking was that of phosphorus or nitrogen, and this almost barren soil was re-deemed and brought back to the proud yield of 50 bushels to the acre at a cost of about \$1.50 for the requisite phosphorus or nitrogen, as the case happened to be. Then, again, there were the so-called clover sick and sour lands, forming a discouraging prospect to the owner of the soil, but analysis and survey passed over the land and scattered a mixture of ground limestone or marl, and lo! as if by magic wand, the soil produced once more. Besides, in the field of experimentation we are impressed with the beneficent results in the pure-seed grains of barley, corn, and oats and in the valuable data acquired from the study of pests, of rust, and smut.

#### THE LEVER BILL.

And now to meet the problem of bringing to the farmer the knowledge and accumulated results of our colleges, laboratories, experiment stations, under a Federal supervision, comes the Lever extension bill, by which this Congress provides for cooperative agriculture.

The Lever extension bill affords work through field demonstrations, laboratories, publications, and otherwise, according to a plan recently agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and those land-grant colleges receiving the benefit of the first Morrill Act. The provisions of the bill will tend to eliminate the publication of effort and will secure a better coordination of effort between the Federal Department of Agriculture and the State



agencies. It is the Lever bill that brings the demonstrated methods of successful farming, the management of the farm, home economics, through the medium of the traveling expert giving his ocular demonstrations, down to the last man, the laborer in the field, the actual tiller of the soil.

Besides the regular appropriation of \$10,000 to each State assenting, there are additional appropriations for each year, until at the tenth year and thereafter the total appropriation would be \$3,480,000 annually. Under the table prepared by the committee it would appear that the allotment for Iowa would be \$93,900.

Provision is also properly made that no payment out of the additional appropriation be made unless an equal sum has been provided by the State, county, or local authority for the maintenance of the work provided in the bill.

#### LEGISLATION LOOKING TO THE ERADICATION OF HOG CHOLERA.

Another piece of legislation in the interests of the farmer that attracted my attention and support is the bill passed by this Democratic House looking to the investigation and the ultimate eradication of that disease so dreaded by the Iowa farmer—the hog cholera. As in many other States, Iowa has yielded heavy tribute to this menace of the stock breeder, and it is not only proper but vitally essential that this Government should assist the swine breeder to shake off the shackles of this disease. [Applause.] It is more than a serious condition to the average breeder; it is an economic tragedy. When he contemplates the loss of his herd fattened by the production of his cornfield he becomes disheartened and is inclined to turn toward other fields of endeavor, and coupled with this tendency is the great problem of feeding our people, who depend more upon pork than on any other meat for their daily food. Thus the ravage becomes double-edged in its destructive influences.

I have a letter from Prof. Kennedy, of the Iowa State College, who writes in behalf of the Iowa swine breeders for legislation looking to the amelioration of these conditions among the breeders. He states that if there was some provision last year for the testing of the commercial serum and virus it would have saved the Iowa farmer ten to fifteen million dollars in losses from hog cholera. It would have standardized the serum, and with the proper serum good results would have been general, and with good results it would have stimulated the use of this preventive and revivify the interest in hog breeding. According to a recent report of the agricultural extension department of Iowa State College, the Iowa farmer, in the year 1913, lost more than \$33,000,000 from hog cholera. The reports, which were gathered from 1,125 different men, covering every community in every county in the State, showed that cholera destroyed 2,827,907 swine, or 34.3 per cent of all the hogs in Iowa. In addition to this tremendous loss, the data shows that nearly 2,500,000 young hogs, ranging from 50 to 150 pounds in live weight, were marketed ahead of time—a heavy sacrifice because of the cholera scare. As a matter of fact, cholera manifested itself in every county in the State last year. In some counties, however, the loss was less than 5 per cent, but in most of the counties the loss ranged from 60,000 head to well over 100,000 head, the heaviest loss being sustained by Sioux County in the destruction of 103,765 head. It is interesting in this connection to note the results of the application of serum and virus, it being evident that where good serum was properly used good results went hand in hand. The director of the State serum laboratory has developed data indicating that when healthy hogs were treated the loss after the treatment was less than 2½ per cent. Where sick herds were treated the loss jumped up to 16 and 17 per cent. In cases where there was an application of good virus but poor serum cholera was given a foothold, and the consensus of opinion of those who have studied the effect of the last year's fight in Iowa against hog cholera is that there should be a thorough testing of serum either by Federal or State government before it can be sold, and also there should be competent men to administer the virus and renew the activity and watchfulness in the development of better sanitary regulations. Personally, I am intensely interested in this campaign against hog cholera, as I am keenly sympathetic with my brother and neighbor, the hog breeder, and I am thoroughly aroused to the human and economic aspects that are accentuated by this unfortunate combination of increased demand by the great consuming masses on the one hand and decreased production of swine breeders on the other.

#### GOOD-ROADS LEGISLATION FOR THE RURAL COMMUNITIES.

In another department this Government stretches forth a sympathetic and helping hand to the farmer, from the Bureau of Public Roads, and in the latest enactment of this Democratic House, the Shackelford good-roads bill. For some time the Bureau of Good Roads in the Department of Agriculture has

been cooperating with the different counties throughout the country in road construction. They sent out experienced road builders to counsel and advise with the local authorities. The counties can avail themselves of the service of these experts in the planning of the road as well as the expert's supervision in the matter of engineering and in the matter of proper materials to be employed.

It was a source of great gratification to me to be of assistance in procuring for Dubuque County, the only county in my district to make application before the fund available was exhausted, to secure an appropriation of \$30,000 from the Government to accompany an appropriation of \$60,000 on behalf of the county to construct a sample road as an object lesson along a strip of postal and rural free delivery. There happened to be a very keen desire upon the part of the citizens of Dubuque County to initiate through this road construction a general movement for road improvement throughout the entire county. The Bureau of Good Roads has built sample strips of the different types of road construction in various parts of the country and have kept most valuable data upon same that is available for the examination and investigation of the different portions of the country which are already engaged or are about to take up this most important problem of the transportation of farm products to the market.

The Shackelford good-roads bill carries the spirit of friendship and interest to the farmer as it is calculated to stimulate and help the road movement in the rural communities.

And so in many ways this Democratic House manifests its interest in the farmer and its desire to encourage him and to cooperate in the much-desired pilgrimage back to the farm. It extends the hand of fellowship and friendship in the application of the latest scientific results for the use of the farmer, and it raises the voice of encouragement and cheer and stands shoulder to shoulder with him in the great redemption of our lands by scientific study and intensive treatment of his acres.

#### THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF.

There are, of course, divers views in regard to the effect of the tariff upon the prices of farm products, and I wish to state that I would not consciously participate in any legislation that would produce gross injustice upon the farmer, as some of the Republican Members of this House claim has been placed upon the farmer through the Underwood tariff bill. As to the Republican tariff, the farmer must appreciate that, under the blind of so-called protection upon some of the commodities produced on the farm, he was obliged to purchase the materials needed upon the farm in a market sheltered by a prohibitive tariff wall, and yet in these periods of so-called protection on his own products he has seen prices fluctuate from high to low. He has realized that in many of his products he was on an export basis, and that the price of his products was governed and controlled by a great many conditions. As to any possible effect of the tariff upon the products of the Iowa farmer, and in connection with the claims of some Republican Members of this House, it is always well to revert to the recorded views of the present senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], in which he states:

I know that my friend from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] does not agree with me in respect to these things, but I do not believe that we in Iowa receive any direct benefit for the 400,000,000 bushels of corn that we raise every year; I do not believe that we receive any direct benefit from the duty on 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 hogs that we market every year; I do not believe that of the \$700,000,000 of agricultural products that we pour every year into the channels of trade, protection advances the price of a tithe of them. \* \* \* We will this year supply the people of the United States and the people of the world with a product that will surpass in value \$700,000,000, and it is idle for even any enthusiast to assert that the price of these products is directly affected by the protective tariff.

At this time I will not go into a prolonged discussion of the tariff and the Iowa farmer, but in closing I wish to insert the following article from an issue of an Iowa paper, the Carroll Times, under date of February 26, 1914:

#### IOWA FARMERS AND THE DEMOCRATIC TARIFF—MARKET QUOTATIONS SHOW PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS GREATER THAN UNDER REPUBLICAN RULE.

The Iowa farmer enjoys better prices for his corn, cattle, wheat, hogs, and eggs under the Democratic tariff that recently went into effect than he enjoyed under the Payne-Aldrich tariff which preceded it.

This is the answer which the daily market quotations for the month of February make to the lying statements of Republican newspapers that "Democratic free trade" is bringing ruin to the farmers by reason of the competition of Canada and the Argentine Republic.

The daily quotations on corn for February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff average 13 cents a bushel higher than the quotations for the corresponding month in 1913 under the Republican protective tariff.

The daily quotations on wheat average about 3 cents per bushel higher in February, 1914, under the Democratic tariff than they averaged in the same month of 1913 under the Republican tariff law.

The daily quotations on hogs for February, 1914, average 45 cents per hundredweight higher than those of the corresponding month in the preceding year.

The daily quotations on cattle average 18 cents higher per hundred-weight in February, 1914, over the prices quoted on the corresponding dates of 1913.

The daily quotations on eggs for February, 1914, average about 9 cents a dozen higher than the quotations for the corresponding dates in 1913.

This advance in prices means millions of dollars of added value to the products of Iowa farms and the revenues of Iowa farmers. Take the one little item of eggs alone: The annual production of eggs in Iowa is estimated by the State department of agriculture at 97,549,731 dozens. An increase of 9 cents per dozen means that this annual production will sell for \$8,000,000 more money. The advance of 13 cents in the price of corn means an increase many times greater than that from the advance in eggs.

#### HERE ARE THE PROOFS.

From the files of the Daily Trade Bulletin, in the office of J. R. Whitney & Co., the Times has taken the quotations of prices for the above-named commodities on the Chicago Board of Trade, for the dates specified. To save time and space, the quotations only for the last market day of each week have been taken, but the quotations for the other days of the week would afford the same contrast.

February, 1913, came in on Saturday. The dates for which quotations are given are, therefore, February 1, 8, 15, and 21. There was no session of the board of trade on Saturday, February 22, a public holiday. The Saturdays of 1914 most nearly corresponding to these were January 31, February 7, 14, and 21. These are the dates for which the following quotations were reported in the Daily Trade Bulletin, and we invite doubters to consult the files themselves for verification or refutation of the figures given by us. The corn prices quoted are the cash prices for No. 3, mixed on track, Chicago, which is selected as a standard grade. Any other grade might be chosen, but the lesson taught by the quotations would be the same. The prices given on wheat are for No. 2 spring. The prices quoted on hogs are the lowest and highest, including both light and heavy grades, but excluding "pigs." The quotations on cattle are for "steers, medium to choice."

#### CORN—NO. 3 MIXED, ON TRACK CHICAGO.

	Low.	High.
<b>1913.</b>		
Feb. 1.....	78	50
Feb. 8.....	49½	50½
Feb. 15.....	47½	49½
Feb. 21.....	47½	49
<b>1914.</b>		
Jan. 31.....	60½	63
Feb. 7.....	60	64
Feb. 14.....	59½	63
Feb. 21.....	59½	64

#### WHEAT—NO. 2 SPRING.

	Low.	High.
<b>1913.</b>		
Feb. 1.....	88	90
Feb. 8.....	88	90½
Feb. 15.....	87	89
Feb. 21.....	87	89½
<b>1914.</b>		
Jan. 31.....	88½	90
Feb. 7.....	89½	91½
Feb. 14.....	91	92
Feb. 21.....	93	95

#### LIVE HOGS—LIGHT AND HEAVY.

	Low.	High.
<b>1913.</b>		
Feb. 1.....	7.30	7.70
Feb. 8.....	7.85	8.10
Feb. 15.....	8.00	8.35
Feb. 21.....	8.15	8.40
<b>1914.</b>		
Jan. 31.....	8.25	8.50
Feb. 7.....	8.45	8.72½
Feb. 14.....	8.25	8.60
Feb. 21.....	8.40	8.75

#### CATTLE—STEERS, MEDIUM TO CHOICE.

	Low.	High.
<b>1913.</b>		
Feb. 1.....	7.50	8.25
Feb. 8.....	7.60	8.25
Feb. 15.....	7.90	8.50
Feb. 21.....	7.90	8.50
<b>1914.</b>		
Jan. 31.....	7.85	8.85
Feb. 7.....	7.85	8.65
Feb. 14.....	7.75	8.65
Feb. 21.....	7.85	8.60

The Chicago prices for eggs in February, 1913, ranged from 15 to 24 cents. The prices for February, 1914, have thus far ranged from 24½ to 27 cents. The average of prices for the past month has been nearly 9 cents higher than for the corresponding period in 1913.

The Times makes no claim that these higher prices are the result of the Democratic tariff revision. We believe now, as we believed through all the years when the robber tariff prevailed, that the prices of things that the American farmer had to sell were determined by the world market, and would neither be increased or diminished by protective duties. The market quotations prove that this belief was correct. They also prove the Republican claim that the prosperity of the farmer was due to the tariff to be utterly false and without foundation. They prove that the calamity howling of the Carroll Herald and papers of its sort has no warrant in fact. They prove that the statements that such papers have made as to the disastrous effect of the new tariff law are utterly and maliciously false.

Never again should the Iowa farmer permit himself to be misled by the false and delusive claim that he is a beneficiary of the protective policy and that the removal of the duties on such things as he produces would diminish the returns from his farm. He should know from this time forth that the pretense of protection to the farmer is only designed to secure his support to a policy that raises the price of every manufactured article that he buys, while it can not enhance the price of the things he has to sell.

#### MANUFACTURED GOODS COMING DOWN.

While the farmer is selling his own produce at as high or higher prices than he received under the old Republican tariff, the prices of manufactured goods have begun to fall under the influence of world competition. Sugar is a notable example of this. The wholesale price of sugar one day last week was \$4.65 per hundredweight. Last year it was as high as \$6.30, and there have been times, when the demand was exceptionally great, as during the fruit season, when it was close to \$8 per hundred. In the great eastern cities the prices of dry goods and clothing have already dropped materially, and the purchasers of such goods are realizing the benefit that tariff reduction brings to them.

These are sad facts for the calamity howler to contemplate, but they are nevertheless the facts.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRIEST].

Mr. GRIEST. Mr. Chairman, when the statistics of the United States census of 1870 were prepared and published, they proclaimed Lancaster County, Pa., to be the greatest of all agricultural counties. The aggregate value of farm products of that county exceeded its closest competitor, St. Lawrence County, N. Y., by \$2,000,000. Ten years later the census returns showed a like result; the nearest competitor to Lancaster County then being Monroe County, N. Y., which lagged \$3,000,000 behind. In the census of 1890 the leading agricultural counties were Lancaster County, Pa., and St. Lawrence County, N. Y., and the latter was within \$1,000,000 of winning. The returns of the census of 1900 classified Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory, as a single county, and although its area was eight times that of Lancaster County, yet the latter won out, but by a narrow margin. In the last census, that of 1910, the name of Lancaster County again led all the rest in the race for agricultural supremacy, winning against Los Angeles County, Cal., with an aggregate value of \$20,767,145 of farm products. For the information of the House and the country I shall include in these remarks statistics furnished me by the Census Bureau for the 12 counties in the United States which rank highest in the last census in the total value of farm products:

#### The banner agricultural counties of the Nation, census of 1910.

	Total land area.	All land in farms.	Value of farm property.	Value of crops.	Value of live-stock products.	Value of animals sold or slaughtered.		Aggregate value of farm products.	Rank.
						Sold.	Slaughtered.		
Lancaster County, Pa.....	602,240	550,499	\$84,426,907	\$13,059,588	\$4,037,286	\$2,790,333	\$879,939	\$20,767,145	1
Los Angeles County, Cal.....	2,602,880	757,985	199,998,200	14,720,884	2,492,378	710,569	63,561	17,987,392	2
McLean County, Ill.....	762,240	733,161	147,846,611	12,811,506	1,094,130	4,144,602	318,180	18,368,418	3
Champaign County, Ill.....	667,520	608,428	123,312,914	9,991,658	858,080	1,573,316	250,486	12,673,540	4
Livinston County, Ill.....	667,520	640,551	121,558,684	11,377,297	925,671	1,298,383	224,813	13,826,164	5
La Salle County, Ill.....	733,440	662,755	114,911,820	10,222,235	1,897,834	1,991,409	206,633	14,318,111	6
Fresno County, Cal.....	3,808,000	1,106,616	92,583,058	7,991,187	1,412,843	1,324,168	89,080	10,817,278	7
Cook County, Ill.....	597,120	387,603	91,648,602	8,941,336	2,276,918	585,345	247,927	12,051,526	8
Vermillion County, Ill.....	589,440	534,383	87,092,954	7,416,946	896,471	1,806,048	246,468	10,305,933	9
Bangamon County, Ill.....	560,640	520,909	85,743,114	7,458,942	805,532	2,979,044	268,326	11,511,844	10
Whitman County, Wash.....	1,349,120	1,157,966	67,357,022	12,540,694	671,386	1,154,180	235,337	14,601,597	11
Arroostook County, Me.....	4,129,920	804,430	44,220,004	10,150,955	738,950	581,726	255,879	11,727,510	12



This matchless marvel of farm productivity, the county of Lancaster, Mr. Chairman, constitutes the congressional district which I endeavor to represent in this body.

Scanning carefully, as the Representative of this exceptionally productive farm county, the appropriation bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture for the fiscal year 1915, I find in it many meritorious features which entitle the chairman of the committee and its entire membership to commendation and congratulation. An examination of the printed reports of the hearings held by the Agricultural Committee furnishes additional and gratifying evidence of the earnest desire in Congress to serve well those of our countrymen who are devoting themselves to agricultural pursuits.

#### AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES IN LANCASTER COUNTY, PA.

In Lancaster County, Pa., the Agricultural Department is engaged in tobacco-growing experiments, is making a soil survey, and is conducting farm-demonstration work. The appropriations carried by this bill for the continuance of these services represent an investment of money which returns to the Government and the people a handsome profit. All three projects are highly valuable. It is evident that the wide range of possibilities for financial results to the farmers is greatest from the farm-demonstration work. It means a study of farm conditions, a determination of the profitability of farm enterprises, surveys which have to deal with the different types of farms, a study of the soil, the relation between crops, the maintenance of soil fertility, and the demonstration of agricultural experiments with the object of increasing crop production.

There is a wide public interest in what the Agricultural Department actually does for the American farmers, and the general public wants to know of the scope of this work, its possibilities, and the activities of the experts and agricultural scientists in their cooperation with the practical farmers. The successful and ambitious farmer wants all the information obtainable concerning crop production. He welcomes suggestions that will increase the productivity of his land and the fertility of the soil. The demand is strong for knowledge of the science of farming, and public sentiment approves of appropriations which will enlarge the value of the Agricultural Department to the individual farmer. No just complaint can be made for the expenditure of money to demonstrate how the production of corn, wheat, and other cereals can be increased per acre. No protest will be offered by the people for funds appropriated to conduct tobacco-growing experiments in order that the farmer can get the best results from a profitable crop. Good farmers know the value of proper rotation of crop growing, and every dollar spent by the Government in efforts to prove the best order of crop rotation is sure to bring more dollars to the people and advance the public good. The farmers can not be expected to spend their own money to carry on these experiments. That is as much or more the duty of the State and Nation as it was to dig the great Panama Canal or to build railroads in Alaska at the cost of untold millions of dollars.

What the practical farmer wants and is entitled to is practical consideration by his Government. The demonstration work done right on the farm by men trained not only in agricultural science but in practical farming is a sound method of proving what the Federal and State agricultural departments can do to benefit the farmer. A year ago I secured the cooperation of the agricultural authorities, business men, and practical farmers in the establishment of a farm bureau in Lancaster County, Pa., and during the first year the results of the cooperative work of the farm agent and the local farmers shows encouraging results and satisfactory returns to the people for the money and effort expended. Congress has been appropriating less than \$1,000,000 yearly for scientific research and demonstration work of this character over the entire United States, but the States and the people themselves have contributed generously in order that the work of the department may be given extended practical value.

#### FARM DEMONSTRATION AND FARM SURVEYS.

There is special interest in that item of the bill which appropriates \$400,000 for farm management and farm demonstration work. It relates directly to the welfare of the individual farmer. No more practical service can be rendered than demonstrations on the farms. The Government annually expends thousands of dollars for research work and the collection of information affecting agricultural subjects, but there has been an absence of means whereby the results might be personally explained and demonstrated upon the local farms for the benefit of the agriculturists themselves.

Recently I suggested to the Agricultural Department that Lancaster County would appreciate the honor—and the entire country would be benefited thereby—should the department determine upon this great agricultural county as a study for

farm welfare. Information worth millions of dollars could be secured by the Agricultural Department if a farm survey were made to determine the money-making factors of the capable and industrious farmers residing in the county to which I have referred. Of course this suggestion was not offered without regard for the benefits which it is hoped the local farmers would also derive, because the investigation is expected to locate the things which are grown, with little or no profit, and to indicate the work which would be worth while in the production of crops of profit; in other words, "a study of the profits of the individual farmer to determine the factors that control his income."

It is important that the farmer shall have financial resources to enable him to conduct his business. Likewise is it essential that the individual farmer shall determine the factors that control his income. To make farming a success certain economic problems must be solved. The farming of diversified crops makes the farm a combination of enterprises involving the use of capital and labor, and it is fair to expect that the farmer shall derive both an income on his investment and remunerative wages for his labor.

Although many farmers do not keep statistical records concerning their crops, expenditures, and so forth, it is a fact that most farmers know more about their business than some people in big cities give them credit for knowing. But the farmers do not have the facilities or organization with which to make a community study to determine the types of agriculture suited to their particular region. Here is where a farm-management survey to determine the profitable and unprofitable farm factors can help the individual farmer.

#### FARM SURVEYS AND FARM PROFITS.

In the interest of my constituents, both producers and consumers, and for the reasons stated, I have made inquiry concerning the results of a farm-management survey of three areas in the best agricultural counties in the corn belt of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, where about 700 farms were surveyed. The facts reported by the Agricultural Department are somewhat surprising. About 57 per cent of the farms studied were operated by owners and 43 per cent by tenants. Most of the farmers were not reasonably compensated for their efforts, as the figures show that many farmers received little or no wages for their labor. With the permission of the House, it is desired to include several small statements taken from Agricultural Department Bulletin 41, of January 14, 1914, giving the results of this farm survey:

#### FARM PROFITS.

##### INCOMES RECEIVED BY FARM OWNERS.

*Average area, capital, receipts, expenses, and profits on 273 farms operated by owners in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa.*

Item.	Indiana.	Illinois.	Iowa.	Grand total or general average.
Total number of farms.....	123	73	77	273
Average area.....acres..	105	253	176	178
Average capital.....	\$17,535	\$51,091	\$23,193	\$30,606
Average receipts.....	1,873	5,042	2,308	3,075
Average expenses.....	689	1,866	858	1,133
Average farm income.....	1,187	3,176	1,450	1,938
Average interest at 5 per cent.....	877	2,554	1,150	1,530
Average owner's labor income.....	310	622	291	408

<sup>1</sup> The value of unpaid family labor, except the operator's, has been added in with the other farm expenses. It is equivalent to the amount that would have been paid to hired help had not the family done the work. The average amount per farm was \$86 in Indiana, \$127 in Illinois, and \$101 in Iowa.

##### INCOMES RECEIVED BY FARM TENANTS.

*Average capital, receipts, expenses, and profits of tenants on 247 farms operated by tenants in Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa.*

Item.	Indiana (83 farms).	Illinois (71 farms).	Iowa (93 farms).	Average (247 farms).
Average area.....acres..	128	202	187	172
Average capital.....	\$1,758	\$2,867	\$2,067	\$2,431
Average receipts.....	1,335	2,257	1,005	1,732
Average expenses.....	492	975	755	740
Average farm income.....	843	1,282	250	992
Average interest, at 5 per cent.....	88	143	134	122
Average tenant's labor income.....	755	1,139	716	870

These official figures show that the average net income on the capital invested was 3.5 per cent, all items of expense, including taxes, repairs, seeds, and insurance, being deducted before



figuring the net income. In discussion of the farm income the department says:

The farm income, which represents the income earned by the combined forces of labor and capital, is the amount available to the farmer for his living and savings, provided he had no interest to pay on any mortgage or other debt.

Deducting 5 per cent interest on the average capital leaves an average labor income of \$408 for the 273 farm owners. This income, in addition to the food products furnished by the farm, represents the farmer's salary as manager of the business. It is evident that these men are receiving only a moderate sum for their year's work. If they sold their farms at inventory value and invested the money in good securities at 5 per cent the interest alone on a capital of \$30,600 would return them \$1,530. In addition to this, they would have the amount they were able to earn at other work.

Mr. Chairman, this is convincing evidence that farmers are not making large profits. The report further says:

The assertion that farmers are making large profits is erroneous. They are living on the earnings of their investment and not on the real profits of the farm. A farmer having an investment of \$20,000, with no mortgage, may receive a minus labor income, yet have nearly \$1,000 as interest on which to live. It is assumed in this discussion that capital should return 5 per cent before allowing the farmer anything for his labor.

Farming is a business and a profession. By studying a sufficient number of farms in a community it can be learned how the more successful farms differ from the less successful. As the business and the professional man makes a study of the best business and scientific methods, so the Congress should provide the Agricultural Department with an appropriation sufficiently large to insure a farm survey which would collect facts upon which the individual farmer can determine the farm enterprises and type of farming which will pay the cost of production, produce an income on the investment, and return wages as a reward for labor.

#### MARKET STANDARDS FOR VARIOUS FARM PRODUCTS.

The Agricultural Department is doing good work in endeavoring to develop a system of standards for various farm products, and the appropriations for this work and for investigations of the best methods of marketing and distributing farm products are items which merit the approval of Members from both the city and rural districts. The department experts are trying to solve problems which relate to the prosperity of the farmer and the cost of living of the consumer. By the adoption of a system of standards for apples, wheat, corn, and other grains; for eggs, potatoes, and so forth, the seller and buyer can better deal directly, and the parcel post will then become of greater value to the people.

Grades for wheat, apples, oranges, and so forth, have been standardized, and the Agricultural Department reports that by the adoption of standards for eggs it will be possible to sell eggs directly to consumers, with a saving of from 4 to 6 cents per dozen less than it now costs to get the same class of eggs into the city markets. As the egg and poultry business of this country is valued at \$750,000,000 to the consumer, of which amount \$500,000,000 is accredited to the egg business, it can be readily calculated that the Agricultural Department is endeavoring to render the individual farmers and the ultimate consumers a highly valuable service.

#### PROTEST AGAINST NONAGRICULTURAL DUTIES.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the greatest of all callings—the tilling of the soil—I suggest that there should be limitations to that tendency in Congress to fasten upon the Agricultural Department responsibilities which are not "agricultural." This bill appropriates \$18,947,000, a small proportion of the more than a billion dollars which will be appropriated in this session of Congress, and yet only about two-fifths of the amount carried by this bill is to be appropriated directly for agricultural benefits, such as farm experiments, demonstration work on the farms, scientific research, and so forth. The balance appropriated, about \$12,000,000, is authorized for purposes that may be termed supervisory work, police duty, or regulatory service, in which the Government is properly engaged but which are not strictly agricultural. These nonagricultural tasks assigned to the Agricultural Department deal with meteorological and climatological problems by the Weather Bureau, the administration of the national forests by the Bureau of Forestry, the enforcement of food and drug laws, game and bird laws, and other laudable purposes not in themselves agricultural.

It is right that we should recognize the present duty to provide and conserve for the welfare of posterity. Pure-food laws are essential to the health and protection of honest producers and all consumers. The Weather Bureau renders the public valuable service for the money expended. These are conceded to be commendable, but they are not directly agricultural, only serving individual farmers as they serve the public generally, and they illustrate my point that since the establishment of the Agricultural Department in 1889, there has been a growing ten-

dency to develop other than agricultural matters under this department.

Quite recently Congress passed a banking and currency law. An attempt was made to have the Secretary of Agriculture designated as a member of the Federal Reserve Board, and the law actually made the Secretary a member of a committee to organize and install the new money system, and he will be engaged in other than agricultural duties for many weeks. That it was a mistake to assign to this task a Cabinet officer having charge of a great scientific department is manifest. If the officials of the Agricultural Department are permitted to concentrate their efforts and energy on work purely agricultural, it will suffice to keep them busy, and the service rendered can be made to return greater profit to the Nation. I protest most earnestly against further legislation which will impose upon officials of the Agricultural Department nonagricultural duties.

#### REGULATION OF PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS UNDESIRABLE.

It will be a great mistake if the regulatory powers of the Agricultural Department are increased at the expense of the agricultural service which the department can render the people. Legislative bodies have in recent years enacted all kinds of regulative laws, and much of that legislation has tended to increase the cost of living. Some enthusiasts have even suggested the fixing the prices of farm products. Rome tried that policy 1,600 years ago and failed. The old Romans decreed that wheat was to be sold at 33.6 cents per bushel; rye at 45 cents; pork at 7.3 cents; beef at 4.9 cents; eggs at 5.1 cents; butter at 9.8 cents per pound, and so forth. Any plan to govern the people by a commission which fixes prices may be described as *reductio ad absurdum*. If the people are burdened with restrictive measures, fair competition among individuals will be impossible.

#### WHAT THE TARIFF POLICY MEANS TO AMERICAN FARMERS.

For political purposes it was charged that the tariff on agricultural products was responsible for the high cost of living. Those who so contended proclaimed a policy of low tariff and free trade for farm products and pictured the American farmers as barons of finance. Soon after the party now in power gained control of Congress it undertook a revision of the agricultural schedules of the tariff law, and revised the rates so thoroughly as to take the duty totally off many farm products. Thus the 6,361,502 American farmers were placed in open competition with the farmers of foreign countries, regardless of whether the labor, climatic, and other conditions enabled the foreigner to produce crops more cheaply than such crops can be produced in American soil by American labor.

So far as the farmers are concerned they now have free trade in many farm products, and foreign importers are preparing to develop their trade so as to take advantage of the opportunity in this rich American market. Wheat prices have for years been on practically an international or world-wide basis, and the enactment of the Wilson-Underwood tariff law has probably marked the passing of corn and oats in the United States from a domestic to an international basis, which means a lower average price for American farmers. With this readjustment of the tariff the farmers are brought face to face with new and more difficult conditions.

#### CORN AND OATS.

Prices on corn in the United States have been well above the 10-year average, but with corn deprived of a protective duty of 15 cents a bushel, already 10,000,000 bushels of Argentine corn have been shipped to this country, and Argentina is preparing to place on the market its entire surplus from the new crop of 250,000,000 bushels. Some of this foreign corn has already been contracted for and is being offered at prices 8 and 10 cents a bushel under American prices. The home market has also been opened for 30,000,000 bushels of Canadian oats. Wheat and other cereals likewise have been subjected to foreign competition with similar articles produced on cheaper lands and with cheaper labor. As a result the prices of wheat, corn, and oats have depreciated, but the advantage to the consumer is not apparent.

#### BUTTER AND EGGS.

An influx of foreign butter from all parts of the world, due to the reduction of the tariff from 5 to 2½ cents a pound, caused a decline in the wholesale price of butter. The importers are shipping butter from Argentina, Denmark, Australia, and Siberia, and it is admitted that the price of American butter will be kept in the future at a lower average level than heretofore. The consumer can benefit only slightly in proportion to the foreign importers, and the farmers and dairymen are the sufferers as the direct result of the tariff reduction. Consignments of eggs are being received from Russia, Denmark, Germany, France, China, and other countries, and it is said they are being landed at an average price of 17 cents a dozen.



## FREE TRADE AND THE PRICE OF BEEF.

Many theories have been advanced as causes for the great increase in the price of beef and other meats. One fact, however, seems to be established, namely, that the number of all food animals has been decreased 7,000,000 in four years, while there has been no check in the consumption of meat. The claim was made that the new tariff law would reduce the cost of living. The party now in power totally removed the duty on cattle and meats, but it seems that the big packers have been the beneficiaries from this free trade. For October, November, and December, 1913, the imports of dressed beef were 32,017,647 pounds, which came mainly from Argentina, Uruguay, and Australia, where it costs much less to round up and prepare cattle for the market than it does in the United States. In order to overcome this it is asked, Why do not the eastern farmers raise cattle and supply the demand? The eastern farmer, like any other business man, counts the cost of production. It does not pay eastern and northern farmers to raise steers on high-priced land, when they sell a veal calf for \$15 to \$20.

It would not pay the farmer to keep and feed the stock two or three years. What the eastern farmers want is feeders or stockers, and with a scarcity of reasonably priced American feeders our people had need for thin and hardy Canadian cattle which, after four to seven months fattening, developed into marketable beef. The Canadian reciprocity act proposed this benefit for the American farmers, but did not contemplate opening the home market for free trade in beef, so that the world would enter into competition with our farmers. To deprive the farmers of every semblance of protection was wrong. Cattle can not be fattened to compete with the price of foreign beef shipped to this country in refrigerator ships.

President McClain, of the Lancaster (Pa.) Live Stock Exchange, is authority for the statement that during 1913 over 4,600 cars of cattle, representing about 150,000 head, valued at \$8,000,000, arrived at Lancaster, which handles more cattle for feeding purposes than any other market in the East. These cattle were purchased mainly by farmers to be fattened for the market; 1,417 cars came from Virginia and 1,131 cars came from Buffalo, the latter being largely Canadian cattle. But notwithstanding the removal of the tariff from cattle the Canadian steers were not sold at bargain prices, and owing to the high price of cattle feed in this country to-day, Mr. McClain says that although the prices of beef are high "it will take an even higher price than the price now prevailing to make cattle feeding pay this winter in eastern Pennsylvania." With free trade in beef, as well as cattle, the American farmer is confronted with a serious question which time alone and a statesmanship in sympathy with the tillers of the soil can solve.

## CAUSES OF SO-CALLED HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Much injustice has been done the American farmer during the recent discussions relating to the high cost of living. It has been represented that the farmers have been making excessive profits, but the figures of farm earnings which I have quoted contradict the charge. In fact, the profit to the farmers for the growth of various products is notably small when compared with the cost of production and the sale price when handled by intermediaries.

Just take one illustration. The Santa Fe railroad has been gathering facts concerning the cost of distributing farm products, and President Ripley, of that railroad, is quoted as saying:

When, for instance, the housewife buys a package of oatmeal for 25 cents, she is getting 3 cents worth of oatmeal, the rest being fancy packages, advertising, the middleman's profit, and the cost of delivering at the door.

Mr. Ripley reminds us that—

In the old days she used to go to the store with a basket, and the grocer would take her oatmeal out of the barrel.

Here is an apt illustration of one factor that has made living costly.

Another factor is explained by the census statistics, which show that between the years 1900 and 1910 the urban population of the United States increased 34.8 per cent while the rural population increased only 11.2 per cent. In other words, the consuming population increased over three times as much as the producing population, necessarily increasing the cost of, demand for, and the prices of farm products.

Few farmers have amassed wealth from the profits derived from farming; and where success has been attained it is due to skill, hard work, good management, economical living, and persistent endeavor. In order that men may be induced to engage in agriculture, either as owner or tenant, that the back-to-the-farm movement shall become as popular as it is desirable, it must be demonstrated that the farm is profitable for investment and remunerative for personal service. This is the essential

step to increase agricultural production in the United States. If the farmer's investment yields less than 5 per cent, and if one farmer out of every three on the surveyed farms cited above paid for the privilege of working his farm—that is, after deducting 5 per cent interest on his investment, he failed to make a plus labor income—then there is every reason why a helping hand should be extended by this Government, if by so doing the science of agriculture shall be better understood and rendered more profitable.

The Father of His Country was not only first in war and in peace, but was the foremost farmer of his time. He favored agricultural schools for the study of the best ideas and the most approved practical methods of farming. He believed farming to be the greatest of all occupations. In his day, and now, and even more so in the future, great responsibility for the welfare and prosperity of agriculture rests upon the Government. To it the farmer is entitled to look for encouragement and protection. In return the perpetuity of the greatest government of the people which history records will rest upon the sure foundation of farm prosperity.

"Go, till the ground," said God to man,  
'Subdue the earth, it shall be thine';  
How grand, how glorious was the plan!  
How wise the law divine.  
And none of Adam's race can draw  
A title, save beneath this law,  
To hold the world in trust;  
Earth is the Lord's, and He hath sworn  
That ere old Time has reach'd his bourne,  
It shall reward the just!"

[Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

[Mr. MONDELL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES].

[Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILMORE].

Mr. GILMORE. Mr. Chairman, I listened with keen interest to the able and clear manner in which the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], who is in charge of the Agricultural appropriation bill, presented and outlined the great works being carried out for the benefit and comfort of the people of our great country by our Department of Agriculture. It should appeal to every Member of this House, regardless of the section of the country he may represent.

In his opening remarks he clearly presented the fact that really only a moderate sum of money is asked in this bill to carry out and maintain and perfect the great work that is being done at the present time and contemplated for the near future in aiding our farmers to more successfully carry on their methods of conducting their farms in order that the maximum of production may be secured and an honest living profit made more certain to the farmer in return for his noble labor. To me it appears that there is no labor more worthy of encouragement and reward than the labor of the farmer. Certainly there is no more necessary labor than his and no other that means so much to the welfare and the happiness of the people of the country. From his fields and his barns and his pens and his trees and his vines comes the very life of our Nation in the shape of our food supplies.

As a Nation we have grown up to immense proportions in all lines. We have spread out most wonderfully in manufacturing and industrial and commercial directions, and have devoted our utmost energies to make them bigger and grander and greater, until we have become almost marvelous in the eyes of the other nations of the world. Our great and steady growth in population has rapidly pushed us far to the front and the top of great nations in these lines. But during all this time we as a people have paid but scanty attention until very recent years to the one greatest of all industries; that is, our farming. We sailed along our sea of prosperity, seldom stopping to think that with all our growth and grandeur we would some day be called to halt and give serious reckoning to the great problem of how we were going to care for the immense body of people that were coming up year by year and adding to our population. We felt in the past that we were secure on this point. Did we not have the great plains of the North, the West, and the South, that seemed almost limitless in their broad expanse, to forever supply our needs? Did we not have the mountain ranges of the great Rocky Mountains and their branches, extending for thousands of miles across our country and furnishing appar-



ently limitless feeding ground for our cattle and sheep, and why should we worry about our food supply? Were we not alone supplying our own wants but likewise supplying the wants to a great extent of the great nations of western and southern Europe? How little we thought only a few years back that we would at this time be facing a situation in which we find ourselves to-day, not a simple one easily solved, but a serious problem that will take the united brain of science and wise legislation to solve in the future. Our farmer was simply looked upon as something we knew was necessary. In the past he was looked upon as an honest, slow, and easy-going person who cast his lot out in the wide expanse to grow and live and prosper if he could, and if not he simply passed out and on to something else. Our hustle and bustle of get-rich-quick men had no time to pay attention to him and no thought of why he did not succeed. He was left to work out his own salvation as best he could, while other walks of life were hammering and crying at the doors of legislative halls here and there for assistance to cure their troubles and their ills. The farmer simply plodded on, asking little.

We glory with pride and spend hundreds of millions of public moneys on our ships of war and our Army. We glory again in our great achievements of building and improving our rivers and harbors for commerce. We are getting ready to spend hundreds of millions out of our Treasury on our roadways throughout the Nation. States and great cities expend immense, almost untold, millions of public money on improvements of all kinds. Plans calling for millions are being discussed and advocated in all parts of our country. Public and private commissions and boards of all kinds who are organized and working to better and make more efficient our industrial methods, that the most economical and greatest amount of product is gained and brought out in all lines of business endeavors; and to all these works and many other similar ones that could be mentioned I say amen to them. It is good work, it is grand work, and I am heartily in accord with it all; but what is the use of it all if in its wake we do not have a happy, healthy, and contented people? We can not all be wealthy; in fact, most all of us must be contented to work and labor for our living by the sweat of our brow at labor wages; and as our outside comforts grow better and pleasanter, we desire our inside comforts to be likewise, and this brings us to those most necessary things that bring us comfort—our food and our clothing supplies. These all come from our farms, our ranges, our trees, and our vines; and if for any reason these food and clothing supplies become curtailed or reduced, the great multitude of our people, the workman and the laborer whose time and toil must be given in our great factories, mills, and mines, are the ones to feel and suffer the hardship most. Now, what do we find the outlook in this direction? All our great fields and ranges that seemed limitless in the past are being narrowed down and absorbed for other purposes, and the remainder, although yet great in extent, are being heavily taxed to supply our increased home wants and the increased demands and needs of our European neighbors. In the past we received an abundant supply from them, and our industrial workers in all walks of life in our great cities and manufacturing centers were enabled to purchase a great variety of their products at a reasonable price; but of late years the abundant supply of former times has rapidly diminished and scarcity of many of the ordinary necessities of life exists to-day, and as a consequence higher prices are prevailing on all our necessities, bringing a heavy burden on the shoulders of the everyday man and uneasiness and discontent into his life. Where he had the choice of most anything for his table, he now finds himself deprived of many things he formerly enjoyed, and is restricted to the simplest of food supplies. This is the condition prevailing among the people in all our big cities and industrial centers. My district, being largely a manufacturing district, depends greatly on other sections of our country for its great farm products, there being no great, extensive wheat, oat, and corn farms and very little raising of beef cattle, sheep, and hogs to supply its home needs and wants in these lines, and it is only natural that anything that could be done to increase the food supply for my people would be of keen interest to me; and in this bill I find just such work called for and contemplated by our National Department of Agriculture.

Now, being faced with this condition, what are we going to do to try and relieve these conditions and make them normal for our people again? What can we do as legislators of the people to help out this condition as it is presented to us and exists to-day? We have already taken some progressive steps here like releasing all unjust taxation that came through high-tariff laws. We are passing through the process of regulating the money question of our country and putting it on a sound and

fair basis that will be most beneficial to the farmer and all our people, and we have done and are contemplating to do shortly many other good and great things to help relieve the burdens that have crept onto our great masses of everyday men and women in the battle of life, and are about to pass this agricultural bill in this House as a step in the right direction that appeals to me to be one of the most necessary and beneficial measures for our future home comfort that will come before us during this session. Each year sees this department branching out in all directions, taking up new scientific experiments and making studies for the purpose of securing the most valuable information to be gotten together and distributed in the most free manner to instruct our farmers how to get the best results and greatest amount of crops from the tilling of the soil upon their farms and the care of their animals and their orchards. Every dollar in this bill is expended for the purpose of increasing the amount of our farm products, our range products, our vine and our orchard products, and at the same time have instructed the farmer how to care for and ship his products so that they are brought to our home and our table in a clean and health-giving manner. What money can we expend that is more beneficial to the life and happiness of our people than that which will help to bring to them plenty of food and clothing at a reasonable price? How long can we hesitate or refrain from taking up and advancing any work that can be done to bring about such a result? Rather can we not afford as a Nation to be liberal in providing the means that will be helpful to our farmers and bring their farms to the highest point of productiveness? Should there be any hesitation or criticism about the little we are doing in this bill when we consider the great benefit to come from it?

The gentleman from South Carolina in charge of this bill well stated how vital every item in it was to the farmer and that it should receive the sanction of every Member in this House. I agree with him; it is also most vital to the interests of every man, woman, and child of our many millions of people who are not farmers and depend on the farmer for their supplies. This is not alone a farmer's bill; it is a nation's people's bill. As a nation, this work means much for our future independency or dependency. It is our future, a nation's food supply; but, if some will have it a farmer's bill, let them have it so, and remember what your farmer and farm is what your Nation is, and let us encourage and advance him, be he little or big. His past in our national life and growth has been great. We owe him much that we have neglected to give him in our thoughtless past. Let us commence now, and for the future turn our great energies and thoughts to him. I have only mentioned a few of the many important branches of service rendered under this department's care. I fully realize what great subjects are cared for all through this bill, and know that there are many other important matters represented in it that are likewise beneficial to the welfare and comfort of our people on which, if I had the time, I would like to speak of, but before closing I want to say this, that our Agricultural Department deserves great praise for the broad and liberal manner in which it does its work. It reaches out its helpful hand to the small farmer in my section with the same freedom and interest as it does to the great farmers of the North and West and South. Its aid is always freely given to the agricultural colleges of our States, our granges, and societies all over the land, to help and assist them in their good work among the farmers to better their farms and make the home life on the farm sweeter and happier, and when they do this they are engaged in a grand and noble work and deserve all the support we, as Representatives of the people in the Nation, can give them.

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KIRKPATRICK].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lincoln said that as between labor and capital the former was entitled to the higher consideration; thus in agriculture we find nothing but an obedience to the divine injunction, "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." Therefore the bill now under consideration comes clearly within the highest type of labor demonstration.

To some the amount of this appropriation may seem large, improvident, or extravagant, but when we consider that of this aggregate amount of \$25,000,000 there are to be divisions and subdivisions in its application, then it is fair to assume that the same is comparatively small and inadequate to meet just demands.

There are no artificial means by which we can produce bread. The indispensable article of bread and meat must in some way be wrung from the bowels of the earth, and when they are brought or produced they should be husbanded with care and safeguarded by intelligent action. There is still much room for



improvement in the intelligent and economic preparation of food, and to this the good housewives of this country are bending their energies as never before.

Whether in farm, in mine, or in workshop, I am for those who labor, and, first of all, it is the interests of the farmer that this bill seeks to promote and maintain. It is clearly evident that it is the intent of this committee to render assistance in the eradication of hog cholera. In my judgment no more laudable effort could be presented. It is appalling to know that last year the farmers of this country were subjected to a loss of \$92,000,000. Now, this is alarming in the extreme and accounts largely for the high price of meat, and the more serious aspect is the apprehension that many thousands of animals may be slaughtered ignorant of the fact that they are inoculated with the dreaded prevalent disease, with no means or methods of knowing of the presence of poisonous germs at the time of slaughter.

We have too long looked upon the buzzard and the carrion crow as sacred scavengers. I would exterminate both, for these foul birds only serve to disseminate disease and death by their filthy, revolting mode of living.

No farmer should allow a diseased animal of any kind to remain in sight after death, and a diseased animal should at once be removed from the herd.

Though old, the adage is true that an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure, and in this way let me urge cleanliness in the hogpen as well as elsewhere. The frequent change of bedding in the wintertime, salt, wood ashes, charcoal, small bits of bituminous coal, an acid swill of any kind; never allow the pen to be on or near a public highway; provide the growing pig with pasture grass of some kind and less dry feed. With an observance of all these warnings, let science assist in the prevention of the ravages of this dreaded disease, for in this way can the producer and the consumer be benefited and protected.

If this ravaging disease can be controlled, then the question of building the Alaskan railroad could easily be solved, and, better still, the conversion of the Father of Waters into an Isthmian Canal here at home, a thing devoutly wished for by a majority of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 30 minutes remaining and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] 29 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY].

[Mr. AINEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to discuss at any length the message of the President delivered to the House and Senate yesterday in person, or the Panama Canal toll proposition, at this time. I hope I may have the opportunity to do that later.

But yesterday, in closing his address he stated, after asking Congress to repeal the law:

I ask this of you in support of the foreign policy of the administration. I shall not know how to deal with other matters of even greater delicacy and nearer consequence if you do not grant it to me in ungrudging measure.

I will confess when I heard the message read I did not fully appreciate the importance or the significance of this remark of the President. But in a cablegram published in the Washington Post this morning there was considerable light thrown upon this delicate situation which is so bothering the President. The following is the article:

THINK UNITED STATES FEARS JAPAN—MEXICAN SITUATION FORCING AMERICA FROM ISOLATION IS LONDON VIEW.

LONDON, March 5.

The policy of the United States toward Mexico occupied a leading place in the editorial columns of the English newspapers again to-day.

The Evening Standard discovers "a marked change in the whole trend of American foreign policy. Instead of 'haughty isolation' based on the strict letter of the Monroe doctrine, the United States is now becoming anxious to stand well with the European powers. The Government at Washington is apprehensive lest if it became involved in intervention in Mexico, Japan might seize the occasion to carry her ambitious designs on the Philippines and Hawaii into effect, and believes that Europe, if so disposed, could lay an embargo on Japanese ambitions."

After reading that article I can appreciate the significance of the last remark of the President yesterday, indicating that he would not know how to deal with the delicate situation in relation to our foreign affairs unless, at the behest of Europe and in order to gain their friendship and protect us from desolation, following a war with Japan, we should yield on this question.

As for me, Mr. Chairman, I do not court, but I am not afraid of, a war with Japan or anybody else. [Applause.] And I

would not yield what I believed to be right on the part of the Government of the United States through fear, whatever else I might do. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, in addressing the committee at this time I am aware of the old adage that it is no use to lock the barn door after the horse is gone. But I want to put in the Record a few remarks embracing my views upon the conference report on the Post Office appropriation bill, expressly stating that they are my own views. I am not calling anyone to task for the part they have taken in the framing of the Post Office appropriation bill or in the conference report or in the adoption of the report, but I do not approve of some things contained in the report, and I can not remain idly by without submitting my protest and making it a matter of record.

I undertook to get an opportunity to speak yesterday morning while the conference report was up for consideration, but I could not do it on account of lack of time. There was pending before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, of which I am a member, for quite a while different bills proposing to increase the salaries of rural-route carriers. I have no quarrel with or criticism of this class of Government employees whatever. They are a high class of men and do a splendid and noble service, but I was opposed to the bill to increase their salary while the same was pending before our committee, and I hope before I close to be able to put into the Record reasons justifying my opposition to this proposed increase.

For years rural-route carriers have beseeched Congress in season and out of season to increase their salaries, first, on the ground of the increased cost of living, which to a certain extent was a justifiable ground. Later they retreated from that position and took the position that their salaries should be increased solely because the salaries of the city letter carriers were higher than theirs. This may be true; I do not know, nor do I express any opinion upon it. I am disposed to believe that the salary of the city letter carrier is too high, and if it is too high two wrongs never make a right.

Later, however, the rural-route carriers have retreated from the last position and have taken refuge in an attempt to have their salaries increased on account of the increased weight of the parcel post. The proof before our committee was that the increased weight upon the rural-route carriers by reason of the parcel post was a negligible increase in weight, and if this be true there is no justifiable argument on this proposition that their salaries should be increased by reason of the parcel post.

I have heard various departments of the Government and various bureaus in the different departments of the Government criticized upon the floor of the House by Members time and time again because of their everlasting and incessant demands for more money. But here is a place, gentlemen, where no criticism whatever should fall upon the Post Office Department or any of its bureaus. The Postmaster General, a man of extended experience, a former Member of this House, always liberal in the increase of salaries, stated before our committee that he did not ask an increase of salary for any of his employees, that while none of them were overpaid they were all paid a sufficient salary. Notwithstanding the statement and desire of the Postmaster General not to have an increase of salaries of any of his employees, the conference report on the Post Office bill, adopted yesterday, shows that we have increased the salaries of employees to an amount of approximately \$5,000,000 a year. So far as the Post Office Department is concerned, I hope that in the future no man will rise on the floor of this House and criticize it, when we have given it upward of \$5,000,000 more than it asked.

The provision to which I refer got on the floor of the House when the appropriation bill was pending here, and was stricken out on a point of order. The friends of the increase sought the Senate, and it was inserted in that body and became a law in the agreeing to the conference report. No hearings were had before our committee whatever as to what the bill would cost the Government, and, so far as I know, no information was sought by our committee from the Post Office Department upon the bill proposing to increase the salaries of rural-route carriers. The conference report shows that this item alone will increase the appropriations of the Post Office bill \$4,350,000 a year. In addition to this, the conference report agreed to another item in the nature of an increase of salaries, which will cost the Government I do not know how much.

I do not believe we can justify this wild extravagance with the people's money. While the political exigencies of our party may be great in the way of procuring nominations and reelec-



tions to Congress, yet I oppose this way of making appropriations. It is unfair to the taxpayers of this country, and I desire to protest against it in the most vigorous and positive language possible. If I were talking for home consumption, I would keep my mouth shut and say nothing about it, because I have a large number of rural-route carriers traveling all over my district six days in every week, and no doubt they will be electioneering against me. But I can not, in the discharge of my duty, remain idly by and see the people burdened to the extent of practically four and a half millions a year by a class of people that, in my judgment, are already receiving a sufficient salary. Two or three years ago we were denouncing the Republican Party on the floor of the House as plundering the Treasury of the United States, in their wild, extravagant appropriations, and we have denounced them time and time again in the most vehement language in our platforms, and I am wondering whether this denunciation upon the floor of the House of the Republican Party for their appropriations, and our denunciation of their course in our party's platform, were solely for the purpose of getting into power. If the denunciation was in good faith, we ought to live up to it, and live up to our platform promises and pledges.

It may not be amiss at this time to read into the Record some of our platform promises and denunciations of the Republican Party for their extravagance with the people's money. In 1908 our platform contained the following plank:

**Economy in administration:** The Republican Congress in the session just ended made appropriations amounting to \$1,008,000,000, exceeding the total expenditure of the past fiscal year by \$90,000,000, and leaving a deficit of more than \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year just ended. We denounce the needless waste of the people's money which has resulted in the appalling increase as a shameful violation of all prudent considerations of government and as no less a crime against the millions of working men and women from whose earnings the great proportion of these colossal sums must be extorted through excessive tariff exactions and other indirect methods. It is not surprising that in the face of this shocking record the Republican platform contains no reference to economical administration or promise thereof in the future. We demand that a stop be put to this frightful extravagance and insist upon the strictest economy in every department compatible with prudent and efficient administration.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard for me to conceive of an act being criminal unless we have criminals to commit the act. I do not believe when the platform of 1908 was written we were denouncing the Republican Party as being criminals, but I am disposed to believe that we were endeavoring to call the attention of the country to the fact that, through the profligacy, waste, and exorbitant appropriation of the people's money, the Republican Party was no longer fit to control this Nation and should be driven from power. The Baltimore platform uses language almost as stringent as the plank contained in the platform of 1908. The Baltimore platform says:

**Economy in administration. Republican extravagance.**—We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriation of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toll. We demand the return to that simplicity and economy which befits Democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Does this conference report square with either the plank of 1908 or the plank of 1912? Let the English language speak for itself. I say not. If it be true that the salaries drain the substance of the people—and grant they do—then why are we adding, in the way of increased salaries, \$5,000,000 per year to the burdens of the people? If these two items in the conference report square with the platform adopted at Baltimore, upon which we were elected, then I must confess I am unable to read and construe the English language plainly written.

The estimates of the Post Office Department for the year 1915 were \$306,953,117. The amount carried in the House bill for the year 1915 was \$305,401,767. The bill as it passed the Senate for the year 1915 carried \$311,772,067, an increase over the estimates of the Post Office Department for the year 1915 of \$4,818,950, this being an increase over the House bill of \$4,758,200. The conference report therefore shows that we gave to the Post Office Department approximately \$5,000,000 more per year than they asked for, nearly all for the increase of salaries to men who are already getting round, sound, sufficient salaries.

I said, and I repeat it, that I do not believe we can justify ourselves before the country upon this proposition at all. There are 2,300 rural-route carriers in my State. If everyone of them should resign, in less than 48 hours there would be five, yes, ten times that number of men ready, willing, and anxious to accept these jobs upon the salaries as they originally were, to wit, \$1,100 per year, and this increases the salary to \$1,200 per year.

I was recently told by a Member upon the floor of the House that last summer there was an examination in his district to fill a vacancy in the position of rural-route carrier, and that 57

men took the examination and 24 of them made the eligible grade. I was told by another Member on the floor of the House that an examination was held in his district last summer to fill a vacancy in the position of rural-route carrier, and that 117 men took the examination. This shows that these jobs do not go begging at the salary formerly paid; yet there are countless thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, of men in the United States who stand ready, willing, and anxious to take these jobs to-day at a salary of \$1,100 per year on a standard route of 24 miles per day.

Mr. Chairman, I may be wrong in my position, I may be mistaken, and I may be regarded as a man without charity and unwilling to aid his fellow men. But this is not so; it is untrue. Who is going to talk for the farmers of the country, for the laboring men of the country, upon whose backs this \$5,000,000 per year must be laid? Because this money must be raised, and can only be raised by taxation. This is the class of men I am talking for.

I recently heard Judge SABATH, of Illinois, make a very significant remark upon the floor of the House when the Post Office appropriation bill was going through. We were discussing the item of pay to contract stations in the cities, and, as I recall, the judge was trying to get the salary of these men increased, and he remarked that this class of men were unorganized, and that that was the reason they could not get an increase of salary.

To me his remark was significant. Can it be that solely because rural-route carriers are organized they are able to swoop down upon Congress and force an increase of their salary? Can it be that it takes organization, concerted action, to force these increases through, whether needed or not?

I would rather talk for and defend the great unorganized mass of people—the countless millions of men and women on the farms, in the factories, the foundries, and machine shops—against these wild, extravagant appropriations. We shall see in the next session of Congress, when the parcel post is worked out to the 100-pound limit, this same class of men coming back here and asking for another increase of their salaries; and, if Judge SABATH's ideas are sound, they will be able, through organization and fear, to force it through again.

Where it can be shown to me that an increase in salary is justifiable, I care not on what ground, I am willing to vote the increase; but I have given this question thorough study, and, as a result of my investigations, I unhesitatingly state that this increase in salary is unjustifiable, can not be defended; and, in my judgment, when the people of the Nation wake up to the situation they will hold us responsible for it. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HARRISON having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4167. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes;

S. 2725. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School, on Sallisaw Creek, Okla.;

S. 1618. An act granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; and

S. 2226. An act for the relief of Joel J. Parker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 13545. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Commerce.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].



Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Alabama devoted most of his time in an extended speech to endeavor to show that farmers do not believe in protection and that farmers' protection did not protect. The remainder of his time was devoted to me personally. That, of course, was complimentary, because to bask in his smile were a gleam of heaven, to feel his frown were indeed "sweet sorrow." Who would not be delighted with his caress? Nearly all would be grateful for his stroke. Standing before a score of enraptured colleagues, a sartorial cynosure, a prince of pulchritude, with a voice rich, unctuous, and mellifluous, he gave a feast to the eye, a banquet to the ear, and allowed the auditor's mind absolute rest. [Laughter and applause.]

Tariff and farming. On the first his speech showed no sordid effect of study. There was a supreme disregard for unaccommodating facts, wholly unhampered by any of the considerations which so often furnish let or hindrance to the flow of language. On farming he showed himself equally well informed. This being an agricultural bill, my discussion was confined almost wholly to the tariff as it related to farm products. He saw fit not to be so limited. But with a voice as of one who wept he complained of the Republicans having taxed window glass, infant swaddling clothes, and tombstones. While doing so he charged me with being a young Member. This I admit, but I hope that I shall never become a Member so old that a great tariff bill may be passed by my party of whose terms I shall be, as the gentleman from Alabama is, entirely and woefully ignorant. [Applause.]

Under the Underwood bill, for which he voted, there was placed a tax on window glass of 28 per cent, while he was voting for free northern meats and 29 per cent on southern mica. On swaddling clothes—I am not sure whether he meant swaddling clothes for infants or for those Congressmen who have never doffed theirs, though having served five or six terms. [Laughter.] If he referred to the infant born in comparative poverty, its swaddling clothes are found to be taxed under his vote. Its swaddling clothes are made up of Carolina cotton, which was by his vote taxed at 30 per cent, while he was voting for free corn of the Northwest and 18 per cent protection on the rice of the South. If the child were born in the winter, and its swaddling clothes were flannel, we would find those garments taxed 35 per cent, for which he voted, and at the same time voted for free wheat of the North under condition, but retained a duty of from 60 to 169 per cent on the tobacco of the South. If the child had been born with a silver spoon in its mouth and in harmony therewith entitled to silken swaddling, we would find that this product of the New Jersey mills was protected by a duty of 45 per cent under his vote, and at the same time Virginia peanuts retained upon the protected list at 10 to 18 per cent and the poultry of the Northwest placed upon the free list. And finally he complains of tombstones. I find that there is a duty in the Underwood bill, for which he voted, on granite and marble from 6 to 45 per cent, while by the same vote he placed a protective duty of 15 per cent on the hair of the Angora goat of the South and placed northern wool on the free list. [Applause.]

And that reminds me that he saw fit to characterize my defense of the farmers' interests of the Northwest as the work of the sacrificial goat. Had he been awake during the tariff debate and had a lucid interval he would have recalled the discussions of that time which show that the goat under these piping Democratic times has ceased to be a term of reproach and has been exalted to the real brute aristocracy by the Democratic Party, because while they reduced the duty on the mule—hybrid emblem of his party—there was retained a protective duty of 15 per cent on goat hair, which, as Representative GARNER was reported as saying, "by the holy horns of the sacred goat, there it shall remain." [Applause.]

It is related that in the caucus debate when the goat-hair protection was being discussed, numerous Ohio Democratic Members said that it would be a reversal of the Scripture, which, in the inspired gospel of Matthew, places on the great day the sheep upon the right and the goats upon the left, giving eternal protection to the former and sending the goats to everlasting free trade or the well-known equivalent thereof. [Laughter.] Some one said, "That will be easy; we can reverse the Scriptures, we can repeal in part the Ten Commandments, we can repudiate the Baltimore platform." But the real trouble is, how can HEFLIN, when he wakes up to make a tariff speech, accommodate his stories to the situation? They are "like the laws of the Medes and Persians, they change not," and, like the poor, always with us. In looking up his record, the investigator does not seek to find how he voted—yea or nay—on any great question; he simply ascertains which of his four stories or which of his five jokes he told on that particular occasion. [Applause.]

If I am selected for some slight reproach for daring to defend the interests of my people, I find myself in good company. The Republican convention declared in favor of protecting products of the farm as are other products protected. In almost similar terms the Progressive Party so declared. The National Grange and the Farmers' Congress make substantially similar declarations. The Democratic Party in its platform did not dare declare nor did any Democratic orator of the Northwest in 1912 declare in favor of free farm products when speaking in any country district. Moreover, the farmers of the South are in favor of protecting farm products, as witnessed by the tenacity with which they insisted on protected peanuts, Angora goat hair, tobacco, and rice. When the gentleman from Alabama says that the farmers of the Northwest know that protection is not to their interests, he would unwittingly give what he regards as a compliment to them which he denies to the farmers of his own section, because the latter have not shown their opposition to protection on the farm products.

The gentleman evidently considers that his work in this direction has been like the work of the searchlight upon a great ocean liner, which can illuminate from neighboring wave to the far-off horizon, but can not throw a gleam on to its own deck. [Applause.]

Moreover, the Ways and Means Committee of this House believes that free farm products will cheapen them, as will be seen from the expressed purpose of their bill and the table presented on page 3 of the tariff-bill report. Moreover, that the free listing of meats and cereals would reduce the selling price in the United States millions of dollars is the judgment of the Ways and Means Committee of the last House in support of the free-list bill of that time, the estimate of saving to the producer and consequent loss to the seller being, by that committee, measured by one-half the tariff rate which was proposed to be removed. Moreover, in the vote in 1912 in that part of the United States where men vote their convictions and not their prejudices 3 votes out of every 5 were cast favorable to protection for farm products.

It will be some source of relief from the charge made by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for the farmers of the Northwest to know politically who their genial self-appointed guardian from Alabama is. He represents a dainty little district beyond the swamp and back of the log which has polled, on an average, since he came to Congress 10,000 votes, about one-fifth the vote of a congressional district in the Northwest. [Applause.]

But apart from all these considerations it is always a delight to hear this philosopher of felicity and fallacy, who, if I would properly characterize him, would say "he is the personification of the voice of Alabama." Interpreted, means vocalization without attending or connected mentality. [Laughter.] He always delights, but never instructs; seldom right, usually wrong, I pay him my compliments. Viva La Hefflin Tom. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this great Agriculture Committee it has been my pleasure to sit in almost constant session for more than a month taking testimony, sifting facts and adjusting items, and finally voting with the other members of the committee to report this Agriculture appropriation bill to this House for passage. We listened with earnest ears to the statements of every person and expert who appeared before the committee, from the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States down. On some items we had witnesses from as far away as Montana; we insisted on first-hand information from men actually on the ground, and we got it. It was our aim to economize wherever possible without hampering efficient service, and this bill we present states our conclusions. Without going into detail, I will say that in some items we were obliged to cut the sum estimated by the various departments, while in other items, such as the appropriation to fight disease in animals, the committee increased the estimates. This bill will, of course, pass the House and the Senate without material amendment; the very maintenance of this great branch of the Government is based on its passage. The bill provides the money to furnish weather forecasts, so essential not only to the agricultural sections of the country but to all business, shipping, planting, harvesting, safety at sea, and all matters of life. It provides for the proper supervision of serums and toxins used so successfully in the treatment of diseases among animals when properly handled and when properly made. It provides for the quarantine and inspection work of the Government, and the construction of dipping vats, the breeding of live stock, chickens, and chicken feeding. We are actually trying to discover some food that will make hens lay in the wintertime. We provide for further investigation of the diseases of grain, fruit, plants, and



vegetables. We want to stop the rust in wheat and the smut in corn; yes, and we have a very important item in the bill that goes after the chinch bug, and we propose to get him. You Members from the cities may not know what a chinch bug is, but I do. He kills millions of acres of wheat and corn every year, and, in my opinion, is the farmer's worst enemy, except drought.

The head of the department has testified that he has found a killer that will work, and your committee is presenting to you a means whereby we can put this chinch bug killer—it is a parasite—at large all over the country. We want to stop the blight in fruit trees and destroy the web worm; to endeavor to stop potato "rot" and to assist in furnishing seed grain that will grow; to encourage the movement of "back to the farm" and increased yields; the knowledge gained from actual tests and demonstrations on Government farms to the country, and show, for instance, that there is at least one kind of alfalfa that grows 3 feet high and produces four crops a year and another similar appearing kind that grows only a foot high and furnishes but two cuttings a year—and the big one produces the most seed, too—there are eight principal varieties; to protect the forests from timber thieves and forest fires; for the survey and platting of Government lands to be opened for settlement; to investigate and perfect a successful method of freezing, drying, storing, and transporting eggs and poultry, fish, meat, and other foodstuffs; to enforce the pure food and drugs act; to procure soil surveys that will demonstrate what cereal will best grow on different land; to investigate bee culture and attack insects that damage and destroy the garden; to print valuable information on all these lines and get it to the people most interested; to continue the experiments of the department to determine the best fat-building food for live stock and the most nutritious for human beings; to ascertain the feasibility of irrigation in districts not now considered possible and to look after drainage and prevent overflow; for inquiries regarding systems of road management and for expert demonstration and construction when required—the item will be handy when the \$25,000,000 expenditure is made for State aid to highways recently passed by the House, and of which my good State of Kansas will receive about \$773,750—to establish an office of markets; for the demonstration of live-stock production in connection with the \$500,000 appropriation we made two weeks ago to stamp out hog cholera in this country, the scourge of the farmer and stockman and the ruination of many an honest and hardworking citizen of the Republic. And last, gentlemen, we have provided a small sum to do what we may to prevent the complete extinction of that noble old American patriarch, that pioneer of the plains, the forerunner of civilization, found now only in parks and Federal reserves, whose bones have whitened the prairies and whose hide has decorated the homes of kings and paupers—the buffalo.

These, gentlemen, are a few of the important items provided for in this bill which you will soon be called upon to pass into law. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 19 minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BALTZ].

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Chairman, the Agricultural appropriation bill, now under consideration, is a bill that interests me more than any one of the other appropriation bills, because agriculture has been my life work from boyhood until the day I came to Congress. I am still a farmer, and no one knows better than I the benefits derived by the farmers through the Agricultural Department. I want to say right here that every dollar we appropriate for the purpose of promoting agriculture is money well invested, because the country at large will be benefited through the superior knowledge farmers receive by reading the Agricultural Department literature, which in most cases has a free distribution.

Mr. Chairman, no objection to the provisions of this bill rises in my mind. I look at it simply from the standpoint of a moderately successful farmer, not an experimental farmer, who recreates on the land in the summer and piles up his wealth in the cities in the winter, or the farmer who cultivates some fad or fancy on the farm through the hands of hired employees and who pockets his losses without a regret, so long as his theories or ideas are carried out. No; it is from the view of an old-fashioned, horny-handed, early-to-bed and early-to-rise farmer that I look upon this bill and admire it. To me it is a revelation to think of the millions of dollars herein appropriated for agriculture and its many branches. It means much to the farmers of this country if they will pause and think and learn of the advantages, scientific and otherwise, which will be laid before them through the provisions of this act. No

doubt the Government is doing a mighty work for agriculture, and no question but that it is being more and more appreciated by the farmers throughout the country. What astronomy has done for the navigator the Government is endeavoring to do for the farmer, and this measure is the annual portion of the foundation of that great structure which is being erected for the welfare of the men who till the land and protect and conserve the forests.

Still, is there not something more and beyond all this? Can we not secure results more rapidly than we are doing by getting closer and nearer to that great class of the farming element which reads only when work is done, and whose hours of daily labor are not controlled or regulated by any organization or State or governmental enactment?

With thousands of immigrants daily pouring in upon us from foreign shores; with farms abandoned yearly; with our population in the cities increasing by leaps and bounds; with production lessening daily, where is relief? It must be in the land, and I am one who believes that in time the pendulum will swing back to the point where farming will become a profession; when the broad acres of this country will bloom with bumper crops; when science and industry and love of nature will join hands and produce hundreds where only bushels grew before.

To bring this about, in my mind at least, there are two things necessary: First, to so educate the young, to so instill in their minds the love of the soil, the home, and the occupation that the bustle, the glare, and the excitement of the cities will not attract them, inducing them to leave the old folks on the farm, either to rent or abandon it when age shall have rendered them too feeble to care for it. Second, our education of the young—at least in the rural communities—must be conducted along different lines. Please do not understand me as opposed to education. Far from it. Yet I believe the sons and the daughters of the farmers of the present generation have been too highly educated in certain branches. It is the sort of education which drives from these pupils the love of plants and fruits and flowers; of growing and unfolding and ripening crops; of lowing kine and the scent of new-mown hay. It leads them along the pathways of higher ambitions, of (to them) loftier ideals and aspirations, to which many aspire and few attain. It beckons them to fields of luxury and ease and opulence, only in the end to vanish and leave them hopelessly shattered and deserted.

Let us, for a moment, look at conditions in this country, especially with regard to the urban and rural population. In 1800, 97 per cent of our population was rural and 3 per cent urban. In 1900 only 59½ per cent was found in the rural communities. In 1910 this was reduced to about 54 per cent, and to-day it is estimated to be not quite 50 per cent, or, for the first time in our history, the urban population is greater than the rural. No wonder the cost of living has increased. No wonder our Treasury reaped great balances from import trade. Little wonder that the people of this country applauded a tariff bill which by its provisions will increase those imports at lower prices to the consumer.

Foreign nations long ago recognized this danger of the absorption of the rural population by the cities and towns. The smaller the countries the more imminent was the danger. Denmark, for instance, only in area about as large as the State of Illinois, was among the first to see the importance of counteracting this condition. Her wise men were wise indeed. Their remedy was education; not the education of which I spoke a moment ago; not the university in the populous centers; not the school of arts and languages. Better than this, they established schools among the people; they carried education of the proper sort to the homes of agriculturists. There are schools for the young, for the youths, for the men and women—"grown-up" schools they call them. From the moment the youth of 5 enters these schools until he has completed a course at his agricultural college there is instilled in his mind love of country, love of home, and love of the soil. He is instructed in farming and how to make it pay. He is taught how to establish a home on the farm and how to live contentedly in it. He is grounded in the belief that the farmer, the producer, the furnisher, is the most useful, the most independent, and the most desirable citizen. And all this labor and expenditure has paid. In 1840 of the total population of Denmark, 85 per cent was rural; in 1890 that population had fallen to 21 per cent; in 1901 it rose to 28 per cent; and in 1906 it had grown to the unbelievable degree of 90 per cent. This wonderful result is a glowing tribute to Denmark's system of education in the rural communities. Her present contentment, prosperity, and happiness are due to nothing else.



So to one whose education has been neglected, who has never been won by the lure of the cities, but who still believes that in the farm is hidden the jewel of harmless prosperity and real content, it seemed permissible at this time that he might intrude his views upon this House, and venture the hope that at some no distant day, in a measure such as we are now considering, provision might be made for the education of the young of our rural communities along the lines which will instill into their minds the fact that agriculture is a worthy occupation; that will teach them that the farm, large or small, is a little kingdom, a monarchy all their own, where no whim of fortune, no depression of business, nothing but a nation-wide disaster, can upset their thrones or bring want to their doors.

The farmer can use all the honorable means that any business man invokes. He can do more. He can watch every dollar of his profit grow and can rest easily and comfortably in the thought that its growth is not taking away from another that which he has thus earned.

I thank you for your attention. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have but one speech on this side. I shall be glad if the gentleman from Iowa will use some of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] has 13 minutes left.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEVER. Then I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident that my speech on yesterday has greatly disturbed the high-tariff champion of Nebraska. I felt it my duty to give the gentleman a word of warning before it was everlastingly too late—to tell him of the dangers that lurk along the highway of Republican protection, and to warn him of the political pitfalls and quagmires that await his footsteps if he continues to advocate the repudiated high-tariff doctrine of the old stand-pat Republican Party. It was my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to prevent, if I could, the repetition of the thoughtless and inexcusable blunder of the gentleman—that of standing here in this enlightened age trying to convince the farmers of the country that it is to their interest to have added to the price of their necessities the additional burden of a tariff tax. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that I have warned and pleaded in vain with the gentleman from Nebraska. Some people stumble over a situation and never see it. They have eyes to see and see not, ears to hear and hear not, minds to understand and understand not. Let me paraphrase the Scripture, and say the wise man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself, but the foolish pass on and are punished.

The American farmer can no longer be deceived and imposed upon by the agents and advocates of high protection. He has suffered long at the hands of the Republican Party. If he had in his pocket now the money that your party has wrung from him through unjust and burdensome tariff taxes, he could enjoy more of the comforts and conveniences of life. Be it said to the everlasting credit of the farmer that he has at last repudiated the system that gave him 10 cents in a tariff tax on what he had to sell and took from him 90 cents on what he had to buy.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Nebraska had been any kind of a philosopher the old standpatters over there could never have imposed on him as they did when they induced him to appear and seriously contend that a tariff tax benefits the farmer. They never could have persuaded him to mount that old tricky protection steed and proclaim that a tariff tax helps the farmer. If he had been even a feeble philosopher, he would have observed that many gentlemen on that side were thrown by that old protection steed in the last campaign, and he would have profited by their example.

But, Mr. Chairman, in this connection I am reminded of the story of old Uncle Rufus. Uncle Rufus said, "The trouble with the rising generation is they don't know how to ride a mule nohow. The way to ride a mule is to draw the reins close up on his neck, mount him, slip your feet under his forelegs, and stay wid him. Now I want all you little niggers to gather around here and watch Uncle Rufus ride dis mule. Now, you see I am gwyne to draw de reins close up on his neck, and den I am gwyne to mount him and slip my feet under his forelegs and stay wid him." One little nigger who had observed some of the antics of the mule said, "Yas, sir; maybe." [Laughter.] When Uncle Rufus mounted the mule he went up in the air in the shape of an interrogation point, darted to the right, wiggled like an eel, and threw Uncle Rufus 3 rods away in the plowed ground. [Laughter.] Uncle Rufus got up very much humiliated but still retaining his wit. As he brushed the dust from his clothes he said, "Dat's de way to do it. Whenever you see they are gwyne to throw you, git off uv 'em." [Laughter and applause.] I recommend the story of old Uncle Rufus to

the gentleman from Nebraska and advise him to "git off uv 'em." [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman's speech pleading for the old tariff-tax system that oppressed the farmer and nearly everybody else, I read in this House yesterday what Senator CUMMINS, a Republican Senator from the Western State of Iowa, said about the tariff and the claim that it benefits the farmer. The Senator from Iowa contended in that speech that the farmer was not benefited one cent by the protective tariff.

Now, I want to read to the gentleman what the master of the Washington State Grange, Mr. C. B. Kegley, said upon the subject. He said:

The businesslike course open is for the farmer to fight the system—not to continue it, but to smash it.

I place these two western witnesses against the rehearsed and warmed-over protection argument of the gentleman from Nebraska. For a long time you deceived the farmer, and when he achieved prosperity, not by reason of but in spite of the tariff-tax system of your party, you told him that the tariff had brought him those blessings and benefits. He has at last realized that you were robbing him for the benefit of those who were creating monopolies and trusts. But I want to say to the gentleman that the farmer refuses longer to kiss the hand that smites him. [Applause.]

Senator CUMMINS expresses the view of the farmer when he says protection does not benefit him one cent, and the master of the State Grange of Washington expresses their determination when he says, "Let us no longer dally with it, but let us smash it." The farmer lived under the system of high protection for 16 years, but, with all its boasted blessings and benefits, no farmer in the length and breadth of the country has accumulated a fortune and retired to count his accumulations and clip his coupons. But trust magnates and tariff barons have flourished and multiplied under that system. Take Carnegie, for instance, who wrung tribute money from every farmer in the country on every implement in which there was steel. In three years, under the Dingley tariff law, his fortune increased from \$10,000,000 to \$360,000,000.

The gentleman from Nebraska can not deceive the farmer into believing that this Democratic Congress has injured him. This Democratic Congress and the House preceding it have enacted laws for the benefit of the farmer that a Republican Congress failed and refused to enact for 16 long years. Epidemics of hog cholera have seriously injured the farmer in many sections, but it remained for a Democratic Congress to make the first appropriation to check that disease. It remained for a Democratic Congress to establish in the Department of Agriculture the Office of Markets. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman from Nebraska that it remained for a Democratic House at this session of Congress to pass an appropriation of \$25,000,000 to build roads leading to the homes and farms of the farmer. The Democratic Party has done more for the farmer in 12 months than the Republican Party did in 16 years. The present Agriculture appropriation bill is teeming with provisions that look to the benefit of the farmer. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, all time has expired, and the Clerk will read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, office of the Secretary of Agriculture: Secretary of Agriculture, \$12,000; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$6,000; Solicitor, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings; private secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,500; stenographer and executive clerk to the Secretary of Agriculture, \$2,250; 1 appointment clerk, \$2,000; 1 chief, supply division, \$2,000; 1 inspector, \$2,750; 1 law clerk, \$3,000; 2 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 7 law clerks, at \$2,250 each; 1 law clerk, \$2,200; 8 law clerks, at \$2,000 each; 4 law clerks, at \$1,800 each; 3 law clerks, at \$1,600 each; 1 expert on exhibits, \$3,000; 1 telegraph and telephone operator, \$1,600; 4 clerks, class 4; 8 clerks, class 3; 11 clerks, class 2; 21 clerks, class 1; 1 accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000; 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 8 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 clerk, \$840; 15 messengers or laborers, at \$840 each; 11 assistant messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 1 chief engineer, \$2,000; 1 assistant chief engineer, \$1,400; 1 assistant engineer, \$1,200; 2 assistant engineers, at \$1,000 each; 8 firemen, at \$720 each; 8 elevator conductors, at \$720 each; 1 construction inspector, \$1,400; 1 cabinet-shop foreman, \$1,200; 4 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,200 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,100 each; 8 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$1,020 each; 2 cabinetmakers or carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 electrician, \$1,100; 1 electrical wireman, \$1,000; one electrical wireman, \$900; 2 electrician's helpers, at \$720 each; 2 painters, at \$1,020 each; 2 painters, at \$900 each; 5 plumbers or steam fitters, at \$1,020 each; 1 plumber's helper, \$840; 2 plumber's helpers, at \$720 each; 1 blacksmith, \$900; 1 lieutenant of the watch, \$1,000; 2 lieutenants of the watch, at \$860 each; 38 watchmen, at \$720 each; 5 mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$960 each; 1 janitor, \$800; 21 assistant messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 19 laborers or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$540; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 15 charwomen, at \$240 each; for extra labor and emergency employments, \$14,000.

Total for office of the Secretary, \$329,830.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. I desire to direct the point of order



particularly to the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. On February 9, 1889, the Department of Agriculture was created, and fixed the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture at the same as the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which was at that time \$4,500.

Mr. Chairman, since that time there has been an appropriation in violation of that statute, increasing the salary to \$5,000. I therefore make the point of order against the same, carried in the bill, \$6,000, for the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I offer an amendment. On line 1, page 2, after the dollar mark, insert the figure "5" in lieu of the figure "6."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 1, by inserting the figure "5" instead of the figure "6" after the dollar mark, so that it will read "\$5,000."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is not well taken. The last appropriation act, the current law, contained that provision, which was inserted in the Senate and is in the law at this time. I call particular attention to this language:

And hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

I submit that this is permanent law and controls the salaries in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order, and I desire to be heard on it. Mr. Chairman, the statute to which I referred creating the Department of Agriculture fixes the salaries of only a very few of the employees, among which was the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. If the last act appropriating for the Department of Agriculture is to be construed as fixing permanently the salaries of all of the officers whose compensation is carried in this bill, it is very unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that these two lines and a half should be tacked on to an appropriation bill for the purpose of dealing with these great problems of fixing salaries for the employees of a great department.

If there is one thing needed in this Congress, it is a committee in each one of the great departments of this Government for the purpose of classifying the employees in the departments and classifying and grading the salaries therein. I can not think, Mr. Chairman, that it was intended by the Agricultural Committees in both branches of Congress to undertake to fix these salaries in this bill as permanent salaries hereafter. If that was the intention, Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate for Congress. In the hands of a small number of people, a conference committee dealing with the grave problems like this, where Congress has not had the opportunity to hear, discuss, and determine the wisdom of such change—I say if such legislation is to be taken as permanent legislation fixing the salaries of the employees of the Agricultural Department it certainly is unfortunate for this Congress and for the people of the United States.

It is not known to the people how easy it is to make legislation by a conference committee. Their report comes into the House, with no right on the part of any Member to object or offer amendments, and no right to be heard, and I say, Mr. Chairman, I can not believe that the gentlemen who constituted that committee intended to fix the salaries of the various employees of the Agricultural Department. If that was true, then how unfortunate it is that at the very next session of Congress an effort should be made to raise the highest salaried office save one carried by the bill. If that be true, that these two lines and a half were intended to fix permanently the salaries, then it applies to the Secretary of Agriculture the same as it does to the Assistant Secretary. His salary, like the Assistant's, was fixed by an act many years ago by permanent law, and has been increased thereafter by a like permanent law, by a bill brought into this House for the purpose of discussing it regularly, so that every Member of the House might be heard upon it. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I can not think that it was the intention of the conference committee to permanently fix the salaries. If that were true, it was an evasion of the rights of Members of Congress, who have made points of order against unreasonable increases in salaries. I say again, Mr. Chairman, if this committee proceeds in that way hereafter it will not meet with the approval of the people of the country, because some man on the floor of this House will expose it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, last year the Agricultural appropriation bill, now in force for the current fiscal year, carried

the item, "Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, \$5,000." In the bill presented this year it is proposed to increase the salary to \$6,000. That has gone out on a point of order. The gentleman now in charge of the bill offers an amendment to restore the appropriation to what the existing salary is, at \$5,000. My colleague [Mr. FOWLER] has made a point of order to that on the ground that the law providing for the Assistant Secretary provided for a smaller salary. In the first place, I very much regret that anyone should invoke the technical rule of the House as to the salary carried in the bill. This office is held by Dr. Galloway, for many years the head of the Bureau of Plant Industry in the Department of Agriculture, who was promoted by the President, without any regard whatever to politics, to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. This was not a political appointment. Dr. Galloway stands at the very head, in my opinion, of agricultural study and development in this country. In the office of Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry he rendered as much service to the country, to the farmer, and to all of the people of the country as any one man has ever rendered in the same length of time. I think his salary ought to be increased to \$6,000. I think he ought to receive as high a salary as the Chief of the Weather Bureau—a division under him—receives, and I hope that when this bill passes the House and goes to the Senate the Senate will amend it in this respect and make it \$6,000; and, if it does, it is very certain that no one person can prevent it going into the law at \$6,000.

On the point of order the current law provides that—

Hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

The amendment now offered proposes to fix the salary of this officer at the rate which was specified in the current law, wherein this item of legislation appears, and we have considered for years that inserting the word "hereafter" in the bill makes it permanent law. So that the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture is now \$5,000 a year.

Mr. LEVER. And the gentleman from Illinois knows, Mr. Chairman, that the Comptroller of the Currency has held time and time again that the use of the word "hereafter" makes permanent law.

Mr. MANN. Yes; and that has always been held by the Chair. My colleague criticizes the conference committee because this item appears in the current law. It never lies in the mouth of a man who seeks himself to invoke a technical rule to complain about technicalities in other people. I do not know how anyone has the license to criticize Congress for having inserted this item in the agricultural appropriation law of last year; but certainly, when one Member here tries to invoke the rule himself and all the other Members of Congress are opposed to him, as is the case in this particular proposition, he can not criticize because a committee of conference did something by inserting a particular word in a bill. I do not believe there is a single Member of the House, with the exception of my colleague, who would reduce Dr. Galloway's salary from \$5,000 to \$4,500, and I doubt if there is another Member of the House who would not favor the increase from \$5,000 to \$6,000. My district is not an agricultural district. I come from the city that helps to pay the taxes for the maintenance of this department, and I am glad to represent a people who are proud to have a chance to contribute money for the payment of a salary to a man like Dr. Galloway, and I am surprised that any gentleman on the floor of the House representing an agricultural district should seek to strike down the Agricultural Department. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the point of order is not well taken, and therefore overrules the point of order. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I now make the point of order against the salary of \$5,000 for the Solicitor, and I desire to be heard upon that.

Mr. MANN. That is the same situation exactly.

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. The salary is \$5,000 in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask the gentleman a question. It is conceded that \$5,000, the amount stated in this bill, is the amount carried in the current law?

Mr. LEVER. That is the fact, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to determine was as to who had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Illinois to make a point of order against that particular part of the paragraph?



Mr. FOWLER. Yes; and I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly. Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, up to 1905 the agricultural appropriation bill carried a provision for a law clerk at the sum of \$2,500. During the consideration of the bill for that session of Congress it was contended that there was no use for a law clerk, but there was use for a solicitor, and the argument was then made that in order to dignify the position there ought to be some dignified word invented and applied so that the Nation at large might know how important that office was. So "law clerk" was omitted entirely as a useless adjunct, and in lieu thereof "solicitor" was created, at a salary of \$2,500, but at the next session of Congress "law clerk" was revived, at a salary of \$2,000. The solicitor's salary has repeatedly been increased annually from \$2,500 in 1905-6 to \$3,000 in 1906-7, to \$3,500 in 1907-8, to \$4,000 in 1908-9, to \$4,500 in 1909-10, and to \$5,000 in 1911-12. Not only that, but from that time we began to see an extravagance in the "law clerk" after his new advent in 1906 until, instead of having an increased salary of one man—the "solicitor"—we have seen the "law clerks" grow in number until to-day there are 26 altogether with this same solicitor, carrying the enormous salaries of \$58,950 instead of the sum of \$2,500, less than 10 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman permit the Chair just to make a suggestion or an interruption? That perhaps will go to the argument of the merits of the proposition; but what the Chair wants to hear, if the gentleman desires to discuss it, is the question of the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I presume that if the Chair is going to hold the act of 1913 as permanent law it applies to this solicitor the same as it does to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Chair has already held that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will say again in his opinion we have got to assume at least that Congress intended what it said when it included in the current bill this language:

Hereafter every officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

Now, as was correctly stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it has been repeatedly, and as far as the Chair knows always, held that the word "hereafter" makes permanent law. That being true and it being a fact that the amount specified in the present bill as the salary of the solicitor is the same as in the current law, it naturally follows that the Chair will be compelled to overrule the point of order raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the words "One accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000," in lines 12 and 13, page 2. It is not an office which was carried by the bill in which it is claimed the permanent law was passed.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will return me my copy of the old act, I will be obliged to him.

Mr. MANN. That is a new office.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say that it is not in fact a new position, but it is a transfer, as I recall the fact, from the Division of Accounts—the same man, with the same amount of salary, and the office the same.

Mr. MANN. Suppose it is a new office; what is the difference?

Mr. LEVER. It is not subject to a point of order even if it were a new provision.

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. LEVER. It is a transfer, as I have said, from the Division of Accounts. Members will remember that under an act of Congress a few years ago the Division of Accounts in the Department of Agriculture was directed to be reorganized, with the purpose of decentralizing its work and compelling each head of a bureau to be responsible for his own accounts; and this is in line with that, and it is only a transfer, and of course it would not be subject to a point of order even if it were absolutely a new place, because the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to employ persons to carry out the purposes of the creation of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, if this law which my colleague from Illinois has been stoutly invoking and which the chairman of this committee is invoking is worth anything, it is worth nothing more nor less than this, to establish the character of offices in the Agricultural Department and to fix the salaries thereof. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that if the act of 1913 is worth anything, it means that Congress intended to fix the character of the offices in the Agricultural Department and to fix the salaries in those offices. If that be true, and if the conten-

tion of the gentlemen who have just been arguing this question is to be taken as the basis on which to found a ruling of the Chair, then this is a creation of a new office entirely, which is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly.

Mr. LEVER. While I call the attention of the gentleman, and also the attention of the Chair, to section 523 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows:

The Commissioner of Agriculture shall appoint a chief clerk, with a salary of \$2,000 a year—

And so forth—

and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in the natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

And the Chair has held a hundred times that under that language we had a right to create a new place in this bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture unfortunately mistakes the power granted in that law. It is when an emergency arises that additional labor may be employed, and not for the purpose of dealing with permanent offices that have been created by law.

Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly held that where the statute fixes a number of offices and the salaries thereof, a new and distinct office can not be tacked on as a rider to an appropriation bill. And that is just what this means in the light of the act of 1913. Here was an act undertaking to fix the salaries and the number of offices in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. It fixes the salaries and not the number of offices.

Mr. FOWLER. And if it is to take any precedence whatever, it is to do away with all other laws on this subject. And if that be true, Mr. Chairman, as I verily believe in the light of the investigation of that act, then this is a new office entirely, which can not be created as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Now, if the officers are classified and graded as they ought to be, this condition would not arise. I am surprised to find the officers of this great department in an uncertain and loose condition. No greater opportunity for political graft ever presented itself to a legislative body. Were the various positions in this department graded and classified as grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and so forth, carrying servants in each grade, it has been held, Mr. Chairman, that the number of servants in one or more of the grades may be increased, but where no such grades exist and a new position is proposed in an appropriation bill, as is the case here, it has been uniformly stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Are you aware of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture did go through the entire department, regrade all his officers and make certain changes and transfers, and that all through this bill there are statements of that fact?

Mr. FOWLER. I am aware of the fact that he did not do it.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Why, he did. He changed all these offices. He went through all the departments and graded some of the offices, and changed some of them and put them in other locations.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman that that duty devolves upon Congress, and not upon the heads of bureaus. I want to say to him that there lies one of the great evils in government, namely, for Congress to be governed and controlled by the heads of the bureaus and departments. Shall we give up this Congress to the whims and caprices of chiefs in the departments, or shall we stand up here like men, like students and statesmen, legislating for the good of this country?

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman whether he has read—

Mr. FOWLER. I yield for a question only.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Have you read the estimates of the Secretary of Agriculture in the report which he sent to this House?

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture has no authority under the law to report estimates to Congress. That duty devolves upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and you had better inform yourself on that question.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Have you read his estimates? Are you acquainted with them?

Mr. FOWLER. I have read them.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you know that in his estimates he made certain recommendations, and do you know that he did make certain transfers and changes and grades in his offices?

Mr. FOWLER. I repeat that he had no right to make a recommendation of estimates to this Congress.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you not know that he has done it, as a matter of fact, whether he had a right to do so or not? Do you not know that he did the very thing you wanted him to do?

Mr. FOWLER. I would pay no attention to any recommendation made without authority.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Well, do you not know that it has been done, as a matter of fact, namely, the very thing you want done, the grading of these offices?

Mr. FOWLER. I know the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted estimates, and I have examined all of them, if that will satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that these estimates were submitted, that these offices were transferred, and regraded, and reclassified, for the purpose of making the department more efficient? Are you acquainted with that fact?

Mr. FOWLER. I have answered the gentleman. There has been no such classification as provided for by law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this is a new office, created solely by an appropriation bill in the form of a rider. Now, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the chairman of this committee is a good man, and I know his heart is bent on good. I am sorry I can not say as much regarding some of the rest of my friends. [Laughter.] My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman who has just taken his seat, made a great laudation of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. I have nothing to say against him. He made the same laudation of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, who was compelled to surrender his position by an order of the Executive of the United States. Was my colleague [Mr. MANN] mistaken when he used the following language concerning Mr. Moore's management of the Weather Bureau, found on page 1815, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, second session Sixtieth Congress?—

I think, from my own knowledge of the situation, that this service is the most economically administered service, with the work that has been done, in the governmental service anywhere; that the chief of that service is more careful about the expenditure of money; that he gets the best results from the expenditure of money, and gives way a fewer number of times to extravagances than any other chief in the service. It seems to me it would be worth a good many thousands of dollars if Congress would advertise that where a bureau chief insists not only upon economy in the service under him, but himself exercises economy in making his appointments and does not ask for excessive appropriations, that in such a case we will slightly increase his salary. I think that under the circumstances the chief of this service is worth the money for the work that he has done.

Mr. Chairman, this matter interests me only as a Member of Congress and as a citizen, but I insist that before new positions are created they shall go through the regular channels and be presented by a bill to be considered by this House and by the Senate. No other honorable way can be pursued.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel that the point of order ought to be sustained in this case.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I hardly think it is necessary to argue that point of order further. I want to say, however, once and for all, that as a member of the conference committee which permitted this language, against which my friend from Illinois directs his attack, to go into the law, I have no apologies whatever for it. I can demonstrate to this committee very easily that the employees of the Department of Agriculture are probably the lowest-paid employees in the Government service. The Committee on Agriculture believes that the employees of the Department of Agriculture, who are devoting their lives and their time and their energy and their minds to the development of better agricultural methods and the bringing together of scientific information that will be of value to this great country, are entitled to as good salaries as are paid to other officers and employees of this Government.

I want to call these facts to the attention of my good friend from Illinois—and he is my good friend and I am going to make him keep on being. The Bureau of Standards pays higher salaries than does the Department of Agriculture. The Director of the Bureau of Standards receives \$6,000—the amount that the committee thought that the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture should be entitled to. The Director of the Geological Survey receives \$6,000. I wonder if anybody believes that the duties of the Director of the Geological Survey are comparable to the duties and the importance of the position of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman; yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Why did you not cut down, then, the salaries of the Bureau of Standards, instead of trying to increase these?

Mr. LEVER. May I ask the gentleman why he himself does not do that? He is the "watchdog of the Treasury," not the gentleman from South Carolina. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOWLER. But the gentleman from South Carolina is the chairman of this great committee.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois, of course, knows, I hope, that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has no jurisdiction whatever over the Bureau of Standards. The gentleman knows that, does he not?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I thought so. The Director of the Reclamation Service draws a salary of \$7,500. One of his consulting engineers also receives \$7,500. One engineer is paid \$6,500. Another is paid \$6,000. In the Bureau of Mines—a new bureau—the director has a salary of \$6,000. I understand that the Assistant Postmasters General, four of them, receive salaries of \$6,000 each; and with all due deference to them—because I think they are all faithful men—I do not hesitate to say that I do not believe that there is in the Government service to-day a man who is more efficient, more capable, and more energetic than Dr. Beverly T. Galloway. [Applause.] I have no apology, either for myself or for my committee, for trying to put the salaries of the great Department of Agriculture, the farmers' department, upon an equality with the salaries of lesser departments and of less important bureaus in this Government. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order, the Chair has already held that the language in the current law fixes the salaries of that bill. I want to direct the attention of the Chair to section 523 of the Revised Statutes, which he has already read and to which I have already directed his attention, and call his attention to the fact that precedent after precedent can be found in the debates on this very bill, holding that we do have the right to create positions in the nature of employees in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman says that the act of 1913—

Mr. LEVER. The act of 1913-14, covering the fiscal year 1914—

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; fixes the salaries. Is it possible—

Mr. LEVER. I do not say it. The Chair has said it.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it possible to fix salaries without fixing positions for the salaries?

Mr. LEVER. Surely. This paragraph in the act for 1914 provides—

And hereafter every officer and employee of the Department of Agriculture whose rate of compensation is specified herein—

Not hereafter—

shall receive compensation at the rate so specified.

It does not preclude us from exercising the right to add, under the rules of this House and in accordance with the fundamental law, other employees whose salaries may be fixed from time to time as Congress sees fit to fix them.

Mr. FOWLER. But it does provide only for those who were in the last bill.

Mr. LEVER. It provides for the salaries for those who were carried in the last bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Only.

Mr. LEVER. Not at all. That does not preclude the adding of others if Congress wants to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] want to be heard?

Mr. MANN. Yes. I wish to be heard, Mr. Chairman.

This is a very important proposition. It involves all of the bill; not merely the item that the gentleman makes the point of order on, but the rest of the bill, too.

The departments of the Government have certain authority granted to them for the appointment of employees of the departments. The employees of a department are never named in the law creating the department. We provide for the chief of a bureau, or an accountant, possibly, and a chief clerk, or something of that sort, and other employees, to be provided for by Congress in different language in different laws. Of course it is manifestly impossible in creating a department or a bureau to indicate the number of clerks that shall be employed in that department or bureau, because necessarily, with the passage of time and the growth of the Government, the work done by any bureau increases if it is doing active work, and if it is not it is likely to decrease, so that it is impossible in any organic act to name the employees and fix their salaries.

Now, it has been held consistently for many years that, as to the salary of an employee, the current law fixes it. That is impossible in a new law. That was a purely arbitrary ruling in the first instance. Of course in this particular case that question is not involved, because we have here a specific law, enacted last year, making the salaries of the current law the



legal salaries. That is the item that has already been referred to.

It has also been consistently held that the insertion of a provision for an office in one appropriation law is no authority for inserting it in the next appropriation law. In other words, the consistent ruling is that while you may create an office in an appropriation bill, that is considered created only for the fiscal year and has no existence beyond that unless it is carried in another appropriation law; that is, it is not permanent law. So that when we come to a question like this we have to determine whether you have authority to insert an item for an office under the authority which the department has to make use of its employees or to employ clerks or other employees.

Now, there is no distinction between the item here that my colleague makes the point of order on and almost every other item in this paragraph and almost every other item in the bill that refers to an employee. There is no provision of law, outside of the appropriation act, for more clerks. There is no provision of law for messengers. There is no provision of law for one assistant chief engineer or for one assistant engineer or for two assistant engineers or for eight firemen and things of that sort.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment—except that they are carried in the current appropriation law, which is not sufficient, unless we say that the organic act providing for the department authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to employ these employees when provided for by Congress; and it has always been ruled that as to the ordinary employees of a department the organic act is a sufficient authority to authorize the appropriation for those ordinary employees in the appropriation bill. That does not refer to some fanciful office. Here is the item: One accountant and bookkeeper. The Chair knows and will take official notice of the fact that no department of the Government can operate without an accountant and bookkeeper. It is just as much necessary as it is to have an engineer to take care of the furnaces and to turn on the steam heat. You might provide a Department of Agriculture that would only be in operation during the summer time; that would not require heat; but the Chair knows that you can not operate the Department of Agriculture without an engineer to handle what is necessary for heat and power, and the Chair knows that you can not operate the Department of Agriculture without a bookkeeper; and the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in the organic act to employ other persons or other employees is sufficiently broad to authorize Congress to make an appropriation for this person, who is an ordinary employee of such department. Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FOWLER. The positions to which you have referred, such as the law clerk, telephone operators, and messengers, have been created heretofore, have they not?

Mr. MANN. They have not been created, except in the sense that they are carried in the appropriation act, which, so far as those offices are concerned, is good only for the current fiscal year. That is not permanent legislation at all.

Mr. FOWLER. The last appropriation act has always been regarded as the law for a position, has it not?

Mr. MANN. It has never been regarded as the law as to the creating of positions. It has always been regarded as the law as to the fixing of a salary of a position which is provided for.

Mr. FOWLER. But this is an effort to create an entirely new office which has not heretofore been carried by an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference at all.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Is it not a fact that the duties of the Department of Agriculture have been added to from time to time by the food and drug act and other acts?

Mr. MANN. That is undoubtedly the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Does not that increase the need for a law clerk?

Mr. MANN. That does not affect the point of order. That affects the desirability of having the offices. Let me remind the Chair that some years ago—I think possibly before the present incumbent of the chair was a Member of the House; I know before my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] was a Member of the House—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and my colleague then from Illinois, Mr. Prince, started to tear to pieces one of the appropriation bills of the House.

We were considering the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. These two gentlemen made points of order upon every item in the bill as far as it was ever read, and the gentleman who was then occupying the chair held that unless

an office was particularly provided for by law, practically by name, the item was subject to a point of order; and as far as the legislative bill was read, after my two distinguished friends were through with it, it looked like a skeleton. There was nothing left in it. That was the ruling of the Chair; but that ruling never was followed after that time. It became perfectly apparent that if the House was to sustain—which it did not on that occasion—the position that in order to have a place in an appropriation bill fixed by name you had to have a law specifically authorizing that place, you could not ever pass any appropriation bill through the House, and we would absolutely turn the functions of this House over to the Senate, where such rules did not prevail. Since that ruling every Chairman has overruled the decision made at that time, and has held that the natural and ordinary offices in a department are authorized to be carried in an appropriation act by the provision in the organic act authorizing the heads of the departments to employ other necessary employees.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to another illustration. The gentleman will recall that several years ago I myself attacked the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint the so-called Remsen Board, and made the point of order on the floor of the House, which was debated here for several hours, as I recall it; but the Chair then held, although I was taking a position opposite to that which I take now, that under the words "as Congress may from time to time provide employ other persons," under the words "other persons" he had the right to appoint that Remsen Board.

Mr. MANN. If the Chair will permit one other suggestion, I have made this same argument every year at the beginning of the consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill, certainly for more than 10 years, and every year, up to the present time, the Chair has sustained my contention that those items in the bill were in order, and that no one could object to them by making a point of order that an ordinary position could not be newly created in the bill.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that since my short service in this House, where a new position different to any other position in an appropriation bill has been offered to be created, when a point of order has been interposed against it that point of order has been sustained; but the rule that my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] refers to is this, that where there has been a classification and the bill has carried a certain officer—for instance, as the law clerk—it has been held that it is proper to appoint two law clerks, but where an entirely different office has been created, invariably the Chair has held that it was not proper. I have made these points of order myself and the Chair has sustained them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair recognizes the rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] seeks to invoke as a salutary one, but the Chair is of the opinion that he misapplies it. In the creation of these great executive departments it would be utterly impossible, and it is physically impossible for the organic act to anticipate the name of every subordinate position, unimportant in one way but important in another way, that will be found necessary to carry on the work of that department. If we create the department, we must provide the machinery; and it seems to the present occupant of the chair that it would be utterly impossible to anticipate all of these necessary positions. The Chair thinks that Congress in the past has recognized that fact more than once, and has given to the heads of these different departments certain discretion—

Mr. FOWLER. Will the Chair submit to one question?

The CHAIRMAN. In a moment. Section 169 of the Revised Statutes authorizes the executive departments to employ clerks, and so forth, as Congress may appropriate from year to year. This has been held to be authority for making an appropriation to pay the salaries of such clerks, and so forth. That question came up on December 6, 1912, and it seems to be almost on all fours with this question here. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] was in the chair, and in passing upon this question he construed the authority under section 169 to employ clerks to carry on the work of these different departments. It was his conclusion, which conforms entirely to the conclusion of the present occupant of the chair, that the point of order was not well taken. Therefore the Chair feels constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, suppose the salary of this clerk was fixed at \$100,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman could move to amend and have it cut down.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it not be subject to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not; if the House wanted to vote \$100,000 for a bookkeeper, it could do it.



Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I interpose a point of order against the new position, "one cabinet shop foreman, \$1,200." I do not care to argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled for the same reason.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I interpose a point of order against the language "one chief clerk at \$3,000, and \$500 additional as custodian of buildings." The statute creating the office fixes the salary at \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman designate the line and page.

Mr. FOWLER. That is on lines 1 and 2, page 2.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that that is in the current law with the same salary and is no change whatever.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the point of order against the paragraph will still be pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agriculture appropriation bill, and had directed him to report that the committee had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ALASKAN RAILWAY.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Alaskan railway bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to omit the reading of the report and read the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report is as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 341).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed in said House amendment insert the following:

"That the President of the United States is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to adopt and use a name by which to designate the railroad or railroads and properties to be located, owned, acquired, or operated under the authority of this act; to employ such officers, agents, or agencies, in his discretion, as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the purposes of this act; to authorize and require such officers, agents, or agencies, to perform any or all of the duties imposed upon him by the terms of this act; to detail and require any officer or officers in the Engineer Corps in the Army or Navy to perform service under this act; to fix the compensation of all officers, agents or employees appointed or designated by him; to designate and cause to be located a route or routes for a line or lines of railroad in the Territory of Alaska not to exceed in the aggregate 1,000 miles, to be so located as to connect one or more of the open Pacific Ocean harbors on the southern coast of Alaska with the navigable waters in the interior of Alaska and with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and the settlement of the public lands therein and so as to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, transportation of troops, arms, munitions of war, the mails, and for other governmental and public uses, and for the transportation of passengers and property; to construct and build a railroad or railroads along such route or routes as he may so designate and locate, with the necessary branch lines, feeders, sidings, switches, and spurs; to purchase or otherwise acquire all real and personal property necessary to carry out the purposes of this act; to exercise the power of eminent domain in acquiring property for such use, which use

is hereby declared to be a public use, by condemnation in the courts of Alaska in accordance with the laws now or hereafter in force there; to acquire rights of way, terminal grounds, and all other rights; to purchase or otherwise acquire all necessary equipment for the construction and operation of such railroad or railroads; to build or otherwise acquire docks, wharves, terminal facilities, and all structures needed for the equipment and operation of such railroad or railroads; to fix, change, or modify rates for the transportation of passengers and property, which rates shall be equal and uniform, but no free transportation or passes shall be permitted except that the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to the lines constructed under this act; to receive compensation for the transportation of passengers and property, and to perform generally all the usual duties of a common carrier by railroad; to make and establish rules and regulations for the control and operation of said railroad or railroads; in his discretion, to lease the said railroad or railroads, or any portion thereof, including telegraph and telephone lines, after completion under such terms as he may deem proper, but no lease shall be for a longer period than 20 years, or in the event of failure to lease, to operate the same until the further action of Congress: *Provided*, That if said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority herein given, then and in that event they shall be operated under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate-commerce laws; to purchase, condemn, or otherwise acquire upon such terms as he may deem proper any other line or lines of railroad in Alaska which may be necessary to complete the construction of the line or lines of railroad designated or located by him: *Provided*, That the price to be paid in case of purchase shall in no case exceed the actual physical value of the railroad; to make contracts or agreements with any railroad or steamship company or vessel owner for joint transportation of passengers or property over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel, and to make such other contracts as may be necessary to carry out any of the purposes of this act; to utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama, and the Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this act.

"The authority herein granted shall include the power to construct, maintain, and operate telegraph and telephone lines so far as they may be necessary or convenient in the construction and operation of the railroad or railroads as herein authorized, and they shall perform generally all the usual duties of telegraph and telephone lines for hire.

"That it is the intent and purpose of Congress through this act to authorize and empower the President of the United States, and he is hereby fully authorized and empowered, through such officers, agents, or agencies as he may appoint or employ, to do all necessary acts and things in addition to those specially authorized in this act to enable him to accomplish the purposes and objects of this act.

"The President is hereby authorized to withdraw, locate, and dispose of, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, such area or areas of the public domain along the line or lines of such proposed railroad or railroads for town-site purposes as he may from time to time designate.

"Terminal and station grounds and rights of way through the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska are hereby granted for the construction of railroads, telegraph, and telephone lines authorized by this act, and in all patents for lands hereafter taken up, entered, or located in the Territory of Alaska there shall be expressed that there is reserved to the United States a right of way for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines to the extent of 100 feet on either side of the center line of any such road, and 25 feet on either side of the center line of any such telegraph or telephone lines, and the President may, in such manner as he deems advisable, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable.

"SEC. 2. That the cost of the work authorized by this act shall not exceed \$35,000,000, and in executing the authority granted



by this act the President shall not expend nor obligate the United States to expend more than the said sum; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 to be used for carrying out the provisions of this act, to continue available until expended.

"Sec. 3. That all moneys derived from the lease, sale, or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites, in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained, or the timber thereon, and the earnings of said railroad or railroads, together with the earnings of the telegraph and telephone lines constructed under this act, above maintenance charges and operating expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscellaneous receipts are paid, and a separate account thereof shall be kept and annually reported to Congress.

"Sec. 4. That the officers, agents, or agencies placed in charge of the work by the President shall make to the President annually, and at such other periods as may be required by the President or by either House of Congress, full and complete reports of all their acts and doings and of all moneys received and expended in the construction of said work and in the operation of said work or works and in the performance of their duties in connection therewith. The annual reports herein provided for shall be by the President transmitted to Congress."

And the House agree to the same.

W. C. HOUSTON,  
FRANK E. GUERNSEY,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*  
KEY PITTMAN,  
GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,  
W. L. JONES,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

#### STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 48, an act to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report, namely:

The provision as agreed to retains all of the important provisions of the House amendment. The only substantial changes are the striking out of the provision with reference to the application of the interstate-commerce law. The committee of conference has left the operation of the road, as long as the President retains the operation of it in his hands, unhampered, giving him absolute authority in reference to it, but have provided that if the road should be leased, then it shall become subject to the operations and provisions of the interstate-commerce laws.

And rights of way have been granted through public lands, and a provision made for the express reservation of such rights of way in patents which may be issued for these lands, and full power has been given to the President to make whatever reservations he may deem necessary for terminal station grounds.

The verbiage has been reformed and changed in different places by the elimination of unnecessary repetition, and the transposition and rearrangement of sentences, clauses, and words which do not make any material alteration in the provisions of the bill, as follows:

(References are to "amendment" as passed by the House.)

In line 7, section 1, after the word "act," the words "such officers, agents, or agencies to be appointed or designated by him or under his direction" are omitted.

In lines 12 and 13 of section 1 the words "or any official in the civil list of the United States" are stricken out.

In line 3, on page 2, of section 1, after the word "exceed," add the words "in the aggregate."

In lines 7 and 8, page 2, the words "yielding coal sufficient in quality and quantity for naval use" are omitted.

In line 12, page 2, after the word "Navy," there is inserted the words "the transportation."

On page 2, all of line 25, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and part of line 5, on page 3, to and including the word "thereto," are stricken out.

In line 7, page 3, beginning with the word "for," down to the word "property," in line 8, is stricken out.

In lines 12, 13, and 14, page 3, the words "subject to the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as herein-after provided," are stricken out.

In line 12, page 3, after the word "property," there is added the following: "which rates shall be equal and uniform, but no free transportation or passes shall be permitted, except that the provisions of the interstate-commerce law relating to the transportation of employees and their families shall be in force as to the lines constructed under this act."

In lines 16 and 17, on page 3, the words "not in violation of law" are stricken out.

In line 1, page 4, after the word "Congress," there is inserted the following clause: "Provided, That if said railroad or railroads, including telegraph and telephone lines, are leased under the authority herein given, then and in that event they shall be operated under the jurisdiction and control of the provisions of the interstate-commerce law."

In line 2, page 4, after the word "acquire," there is added the words "upon such terms as he may deem proper."

In line 4, page 4, after the word "him," the words "in the first instance, upon such terms as he may deem proper" are stricken out.

In line 10, page 4, after the word "property," there is inserted the following words: "Over the road or roads herein provided for, and such railroad or steamship line or by such vessel owner."

After the word "act," in line 11, page 4, the remainder of the paragraph is stricken out and instead of it there is inserted a clause from the Senate bill, as follows: "To utilize in carrying on the work herein provided for any and all machinery, equipment, instruments, material, and other property of any sort whatsoever used or acquired in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal, so far and as rapidly as the same is no longer needed at Panama; and the said Isthmian Canal Commission is hereby authorized to deliver said property to such officers or persons as the President may designate, and to take credit therefor at such percentage of its original cost as the President may approve, but this amount shall not be charged against the fund provided for in this act."

In lines 17 and 18, on page 4, the language is changed so as to read: "The authority herein granted shall include the power to construct, maintain, and operate telegraph and telephone lines," etc. This is a mere change in phraseology without altering the meaning.

In line 22, page 4, after the word "hire," strike out all of the remainder of the paragraph.

In line 12, page 5, the word "lawful" is stricken out and the word "necessary" inserted.

In line 13, page 5, the word "necessary" was stricken out because it was inserted above.

In lines 14 and 15, page 5, the words "Provided, That" are stricken out and the word "The" is begun with a capital and made the beginning of a sentence.

In line 19, page 5, after the word "designate," there is inserted the following: "Terminal and station grounds and rights of way through the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska are hereby granted for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines authorized by this act, and in all patents for lands hereafter taken up, entered, or located in the Territory of Alaska there shall be expressed that there is reserved to the United States a right of way for the construction of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines to the extent of 100 feet on each side of the center line of any such road and 25 feet on each side of the center line of any such telegraph or telephone line, and the President may, in such manner as he deems advisable, make reservation of such lands as are or may be useful for furnishing materials for construction and for stations, terminals, docks, and for such other purposes in connection with the construction and operation of such railroad lines as he may deem necessary and desirable."

On page 5 all of section 2 is stricken out.

On page 6 section 3 is numbered section 2.

In line 5, page 6, after the figures "\$35,000,000," the word "that" is stricken out and the word "and" inserted instead.

On page 6 section 4 is numbered section 3.

In line 15, page 6, the word "net" is stricken out, and after the word "railroads" there is added the following: "Together with the earnings of the telephone and telegraph lines constructed under this act."

Section 5 on page 6 is numbered section 4.

W. C. HOUSTON,  
FRANK E. GUERNSEY,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, as set out in this statement the provisions of the House bill in the main are retained. There

are very few changes that have any important effect on the bill. The amount is retained the same as provided in the House bill of \$35,000,000. Also the amount appropriated is retained at the sum of \$1,000,000, as provided in the House bill. There was a change made in the House bill by striking out the clause that provided for the interstate-commerce laws to apply to this road. We changed that so as to make them apply only in case the road was leased. In case the road is leased or operated by private companies it will be operated under the terms of the interstate-commerce law, but if run by the President we thought it best not to have any limitation or anything to hamper his free hand and the exercise of his discretion.

The right of way has been granted through public lands in such terms as were not provided in the House bill, and it is provided that express reservations may be made by the President in order to secure rights of way without any hindrance or anything to interfere with the right of way over the public domain. It was also provided that patents issued on public land hereafter should contain a clause stipulating that the right was reserved to the Government to retain right of way, so as to prevent any delay or hindrance in acquiring rights of way.

There was another change in regard to the transportation of parties on free passes. That has been forbidden by a clause inserted here, which was taken from the Senate bill, providing that free transportation or free passes should be given only to the extent provided in the interstate-commerce law for employees and their families.

There are a number of other changes in phraseology, some transposition of words and sentences, which I do not think make any material difference.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. I notice on page 2 of the bill that emerged from conference you have retained the provision which places a limitation on the right to purchase other railroad stock at its actual physical value.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I believe that is a provision that went out in the House committee.

Mr. HOUSTON. It was in the bill as it passed the House. The language in the present bill is identical with the language as it passed the House.

Mr. FERRIS. It was my impression that it was eliminated in committee.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes; and was inserted on the floor of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. There is another question I want to ask the gentleman about, and the gentleman will understand it is not a criticism, but I find it was in the House bill, and that is the language in the bill which authorizes the use of the Panama Canal appurtenances, but reciting that it shall not in any sense be charged up to the Alaskan account with reference to the cost of the railroad.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. It seems to me that that was unwise. What were the conditions that led the conferees to agree to that?

Mr. HOUSTON. Upon that point, I will state that it was thought wise to provide that any machinery, or tools, or implements of any kind that might not be needed in the completion of the Panama Canal, that could be utilized in building this road, it would be a proper thing to let the Government take charge of such machinery and tools and use them in carrying on this work here.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course, that is not the part, as the gentleman understands, that I object to.

Mr. HOUSTON. I am coming to that. It is provided here that the Isthmian Canal Commission shall receive credit for the amount that these tools and machinery are valued at, but that it shall not be charged against the fund appropriated for the construction of the railroad.

This is Government property. It is Government machinery, but the Government has no longer any use for it at the Panama Canal, because the provision in the bill is that it shall be turned over when the same is not needed there. It is nothing but right and proper that the Government, which is undertaking to enter another great enterprise, should have the benefit of this machinery. This belongs to the Government. Let the Government get the benefit of it in building this railroad, and, incidentally, let Alaska get the benefit of the free use of this property which the Government has already on hand.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but the anomalous position is this, that the property we are to transmit to Alaska, whether it be much or little, is charged against the Panama project, but when we take it up to Alaska and install it there we do not charge it

against that project. In other words, it seems to me that the thing that we use in Alaska being transported from the Panama Canal ought to figure in the project, so that in the last analysis we might be able to tell what our total expenditure has been, and, in turn, how far we have been reimbursed. This bill is based on the theory that the Alaskan resources will reimburse us. That being true, I wondered what the plan was to eliminate this one feature.

Mr. HOUSTON. This bill provides we shall take this machinery at a certain valuation, and the Panama Canal Commission gets credit for that valuation. The only question is whether or not you will make the Government pay for its own property, which it is going to use in the construction of the Alaskan railroad. There is a desire on the part of the friends of this measure to make a success of it and do it as cheaply as possible, and we think it but a small favor to ask of the Government that it shall take this property it already has, and has no further use for, and let us have it; and if we want to know what it is worth, this act provides it is to be given credit for it, and you can add that to the cost of the road.

Mr. FERRIS. Undoubtedly; but instead of doing that the bill specifically precludes it from being done.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think not.

Mr. FERRIS. No; the language specifically says that.

Mr. HOUSTON. It provides that we shall have the free use of these tools.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right. It is a gift to the Alaskan project to that extent.

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. On that same point I had intended to address the House when the bill was under consideration, but I thought it safer to leave it open. I do not understand, and I would like to ask the gentleman if he made any inquiry, how it is possible for the Isthmian Canal Commission to take credit for a percentage of the original cost of any machinery. I would like to ask if the gentleman made any inquiry as to the modus operandi. Does it mean that they give themselves credit when they talk about it, or that they put it on the books of the Treasury?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think it is more a matter of bookkeeping than anything else. It shows what it is probably worth when they get through with it.

Mr. MANN. I know of no way in bookkeeping of entering an item on one side of the ledger without having a corresponding item on the other side of the ledger, if you are going to balance your books.

Mr. HOUSTON. It provides this: That the Government takes that machinery at whatever it is worth for the needs of the Canal Commission and gives the commission credit for it. Then we provide that it may be used in the construction of this railroad.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the proposition. What I asked was whether any inquiry was made as to how it could be done, because it is perfectly patent that you can not take credit on the books unless there is a corresponding charge made on the books.

Mr. LENROOT. Would not the charge be made to the Government?

Mr. MANN. The charge can not be made to the Government; certainly not.

Mr. LENROOT. On the books?

Mr. MANN. The books must balance. There is no appropriation from the Government to do this.

Mr. MANAHAN. It is all the Government's.

Mr. MANN. Whether it is all the Government's or not, you can not enter an item on one side of the ledger with no item on the other side of the ledger. The machinery has been paid for and the item is closed, so far as that is concerned. The books have been balanced, as far as this machinery is concerned. If you enter an item on the ledger or on the books of the Government—and I do not know whether that is the intention or not—you must have a corresponding item somewhere. It is not against the Government. In other words, you bring the Government into debt to these people, and that can not be done.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the bookkeeping proposition would be to credit the Canal Commission with this machinery received and charge the Government with what it took back from the canal.

Mr. MANN. And then have a claim against the Government for all time standing on the books of the Government.



Mr. HARDY. The Government would simply be charged just as if it had purchased a horse, and the horse might die later.

Mr. MANN. But the Government is never charged with the buying of a horse and you can not do it without an appropriation. You can not get that sort of item on the books.

Mr. HARDY. Suppose you have an appropriation or an authorization when you pay for a thing; you have to balance that somewhere.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but this is no authorization.

Mr. HARDY. This will equivalently authorize the Government to buy this property from the Canal Commission.

Mr. MANN. It will not do any harm. It will give the governor of the Canal Zone, when he makes his annual report, authority to say that they have turned this machinery over to the Alaska railroad and that he claims credit for a certain amount of reduction in expenses. It will not change any item on the books, because it can not under the terms of the law.

Mr. HARDY. Let me ask the gentleman how he would square his books if we passed a law now taking back from the Panama Canal account the machinery they had there; just charging it back to the Government and allowing them credit for it, to say nothing about Alaska?

Mr. MANN. They could not square the accounts on the books in that way.

Mr. HARDY. Then it ought not to be squared now.

Mr. MANN. It should be squared now. We take it back from the Panama Canal Commission. The gentleman talks about the Government owning machinery; the Government owns the machinery now.

Mr. HARDY. Suppose for the sake, however, of wanting to see what the Panama Canal has cost when they get through with their work we have certain remnants of property for which we have no further use and they turn them back to the Government.

Mr. MANN. Turn them back to the Government! They are owned by the Government now; they can not turn them back.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman wants to do something to show the Panama Canal left that property; that is all.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is done by writing an essay, it can not be done by keeping books.

Mr. HARDY. I think this is an essay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the gentleman's exposition, I believe he inadvertently omitted to call the attention of the House to a very material change. As I understand, one of the main purposes of this legislation was to provide a railroad to reach the coal fields which would yield coal of such a quality as could be used in the Navy. Now I find in the bill reported by the conferees all reference omitted of that special clause in the House bill which says the purpose is to construct a railroad to reach coal fields yielding coal sufficient in quality and quantity for naval use. That is stricken out entirely and in lieu thereof I find this phraseology:

To construct a road connecting with a coal field or coal fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral and other resources of Alaska.

Now, I wish to ask the gentleman why the supporters of this project abandoned the contention that this railroad is to be built to furnish a supply of coal suitable for the Navy, and under the bill as now presented to the House there is no such restriction whatsoever in the construction of the road?

Mr. HOUSTON. In answer to that question I would say that the reason we struck out the words "sufficient in quantity and quality for naval use" was because, after consideration, we concluded they were improper terms to qualify and describe just the character of the coal to be established or describe the purpose for which the road was to be built. There is no very definite meaning in those terms; you can not tell what quantity or how much would be sufficient; you can not beforehand judge accurately as to a sufficient quantity or exactly just what the grade might be; but the provision which is inserted there provides it is for the purpose of shipping coal for the use of the Navy, and there is no need of a limitation such as these words contain.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon; there is no qualification in the bill which is now reported that the coal shall be of a quality for use of the Navy—

Mr. HOUSTON. Where is it?

Mr. STAFFORD. First page, about six lines from the bottom. And with a coal field or fields so as best to aid in the development of the agricultural and mineral or other resources of Alaska and—

Mr. HOUSTON. And it says also to provide for the transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, troops, arms, munitions of war, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. It says to provide transportation of coal for the Army and Navy, but I understood the bill as it originally passed the House to provide the road could not be built unless there was coal of such a quality that it could be utilized for the Navy, but now the road will be built or is authorized to be built regardless of whether there is coal there of a quality that can be utilized for naval purposes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Well, if the gentleman will just think about this he is sure to realize when you provide to build a road to a point to ship coal sufficient in quantity or quality for naval use that that is an indefinite thing, that perhaps the engineer and the Government officials, having that impression in mind, might possibly make a mistake and take it to some field which might not be of the very highest order desired. It is a vague qualification, it is a vague limitation, and it is not necessary, especially in view of the fact we provide just afterwards it shall be for the purpose of shipping coal for the Army and Navy. Now, I think the gentleman voted for the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. I did. I will say to the gentleman I voted for it because it was to provide coal for naval purposes and for that especially. If I had understood there was no coal up there that would be suitable for naval purposes, I could not justify my vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. We thoroughly believe that it will provide for the transportation of coal of a very high quality and for naval use. We believe all that. Yet we do not think it proper to make that a qualification as to the location of a road and make it depend upon that.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] a question. If there was a coal field containing coal not suitable for the Navy but for commercial purposes within 20 miles of the main line of the railroad, do you not think the President ought to have authority to build a branch to that coal field?

Mr. STAFFORD. He would have authority under the House bill to build such feeders. Under that bill he would not have authority to construct this railroad unless there was coal there suitable for naval purposes, but under the bill now presented to the House he has authority to build this railroad whether there is coal there for naval purposes or not.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question. I understood the gentleman to say that he voted for this bill when it passed the House?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Record so shows; and not only does the Record show it, but I stated on the floor of the House that I was going to vote for it, and stated the reasons why I voted for it.

Mr. WATSON. I wanted to remind the gentleman that the coal in Alaska has not changed from that day to this, and if it was good for naval use then it is now.

Mr. STAFFORD. From the exposition held on the floor of the House I was in doubt, from statements made, whether they did have coal there fit for naval use. However, I resolved my doubts in favor of the proponents of the measure. I did not know but that you had a notion now that it was about passed to withdraw the mask from the bill and admit that it is a bill purposely for the exploitation of the "frozen north."

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as the Alaskan railroad bill comes back in its final form to the House it contains a provision that no free transportation—that is, passes—shall be permitted upon the roads. I think that provision, if it does nothing else except to emphasize that policy, is in point, for there is evidence in the country that the antifree-pass policy is breaking down.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has made several investigations as to the violation of the provision in the interstate-commerce law against the use of free passes, and indictments have followed in Colorado. They have also investigated in Montana and have found violations there. While the Interstate Commerce Commission was investigating in Montana it had occasion to look into the books in the general offices of two railroad companies in Chicago, and it found there some very curious documents, documents which purport to be letters signed by one "John T. Denvir," chairman of a joint committee, known as the "legislative public-utilities commission" of the State

of Illinois. It seems that among the documents unearthed in the general offices of those two transcontinental roads is a letter signed, or purported to be signed, by John T. Denvir, requesting an annual pass over the Burlington lines on account of the legislative public-utilities commission. I am now quoting from the Interstate Commerce Commission report:

A reply having been mailed to John T. Denvir at what is understood to be his regular address, stating that the Burlington issues no free transportation, State or interstate, the following communication bearing the same signature in the same handwriting was later received by the general counsel of the company on what appears to be the official letterhead of the commission.

I recommend this letter to the attention of the House. It is purported to be from John T. Denvir, and is as follows:

I regret exceedingly to acknowledge receipt of your letter in which you refuse me annual transportation over your lines in Illinois. As chairman of the public-utilities commission you can look for legislation that will work hardship to your company, and I wish to assure you that when our commission get through with you that you will find your road in the hands of a receiver, for you certainly are violating the laws of the State in a great many respects, and we know it, but have gone along and been friendly to you; but inasmuch as you are inclined to be so diplomatic in your statement that you would not "like to violate the custom you have indulged in," I feel inclined to think that a little resolution with respect to a committee for a thorough investigation of your gross negligence with regard to your methods of procedure will be well to adopt at the next meeting of the senate.

Hoping that you can see fit to favor our commission's request, I am, as ever,

Faithfully, yours,

JOHN T. DENVIR.

The commission continues:

When these and other letters in the same file of correspondence were called to Mr. Denvir's attention he denied that the signatures were his or that the letters were written by his authority. When his attention was called to the fact that the above letter was in direct reply to a letter addressed to him by the general counsel of the Burlington, at his Chicago residence, and that he alone could have used the pass had one been issued, Mr. Denvir vaguely stated that some one had been playing a joke. Although the opportunity for a full explanation was afforded Mr. Denvir, it was not forthcoming, and we deem it our duty to make this record of the matter. It is well to add that our investigations of the records of other carriers at Chicago show that many requests have been made in the past for free transportation for the use of "John T. Denvir." The records of the Illinois Central show that a refusal to issue such a free pass was followed by the receipt of a letter to its vice president as follows—

And I commend this to the attention of this House. This is the letter—

Replying to your favor, which I am returning to you, will say that I insist you grant me transportation requested, and will not accept no as the answer. In the event you disregard my request you can rest assured that in the next general assembly, the forty-eighth, of which I will be a member, I will introduce a bill with regard to frontage on the lake front from Sixty-third Street to Randolph Street, which belongs to the State of Illinois, and which you realize was never purchased or leased.

Furthermore, if you object, you can refuse to honor my annual pass over your lines also. It is not my aim to be disagreeable in the matter, and I am therefore at a loss to understand how you can consistently refuse me.

Soliciting your reply, I beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

JOHN T. DENVIR.

The commission says:

The signature to this document apparently is in the same handwriting as the signature to the letter quoted above.

Now, the commission in its—

Mr. FERRIS. Do all the rest of the commission have the same amount of intelligence that this man seems to have?

Mr. MURDOCK. There is no evidence to that effect.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. MURDOCK. The date is not given.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like one minute more.

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is fair to say and it is wise to say that the commission is on guard on this matter, and every time a violation occurs takes steps and notifies the proper officer to prosecute. And the commission, at the conclusion of the bulletin I am reading, issued February 4 last, speaking of the widespread practice of the use—

Mr. MANN. This was intrastate business.

Mr. MURDOCK. The law passed in 1906, a copy of which I have—

Mr. MANN. That does not affect these passes at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. It does affect passes given to interstate shippers.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is what I am speaking of.

Mr. MADDEN. The matter that the gentleman refers to does not affect interstate commerce.

Mr. MURDOCK. It affects it if Mr. John T. Denvir was an interstate shipper. He was a Republican, I believe.

Mr. MANN. Oh, he was a Democrat.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was he a Democrat?

Mr. MANN. I think so.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thought he was a Republican. But there is nothing here to show it.

Mr. MADDEN. I simply say to the gentleman from Kansas that the matter referred to, that he is reading to the House, had nothing to do with interstate transportation at all. It was purely an intrastate matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is nothing in this to show it. Now, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] will yield to me a minute further, I want to put something into the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman said he would yield to me in a minute. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOUSTON. I will yield one minute more to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURDOCK. The commission says it is diligent and vigilant in this matter and it issues this general warning, and I think it is such a good thing that it should go into the RECORD:

On broad general grounds, however, all must condemn such practices, and the carriers that dissipate their revenues in that form and recoup the loss in their rates will find, sooner or later, that this commission will not lose sight of the practice when their rates are questioned in complaints pending before us.

Mr. GARDNER. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think it any worse for a man to seek transportation by a free pass than for a President of the United States to accept a free railroad train, as a recent President did? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I do not know. Will the gentleman say he has never traveled on free transportation?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes, I have refused it repeatedly.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the gentleman is one man out of ten thousand.

Mr. GARDNER. Understand me. I do not boast about it and I never said this before, but I never did travel on a free pass.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman means not since there is an express provision in the law forbidding the use of passes.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, no. I ask the gentleman whether there is any difference between a man seeking transportation by a free pass and the President of the United States taking free trains, as the leader of the gentleman's party did? [Laughter.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; "the leader of the gentleman's party" did not.

Mr. HOUSTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would now be very well to declare war with Mexico inasmuch as we have the standpatters and Progressive Republicans at war over the statement of Mr. Denvir, a gentleman who is said to be a Democrat. [Laughter.] I think it is an opportune time now for war.

Now, I want to say, with reference to the adoption of this conference report, that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] asked a very pertinent question, although I do not think that it is material now because he is wedded to the bill, and he had an opportunity to investigate the facts as to what the quality and the quantity of the coal in Alaska is, so far as statistics went, before he cast his original vote.

So far as the conference report is concerned, I believe that as the literal construction of the bill goes the bill is as good a bill as you can get for those of you who want a bill enacted to construct a railroad in Alaska. But I have not seen anything to change my mind and to cause me to change my vote since the bill originally passed the House.

I am not going to take up the time of this House in asking for a roll call, and I am not going to take up the time of this House which is needed for other business that should be dispensed with and delay the House longer on this report, except to say that I feel as I did when the bill passed the House, that I am not in accord with the measure, not in regard to its form, but in regard to its principle and the theory underlying the project by which we are undertaking to construct a railroad in Alaska. Therefore I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. Speaker, and content myself with saying that I am opposed to the passage of the bill in its entirety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for two minutes.



Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I desire only to say that I have doubted the propriety of the passage of this bill from the start. I doubt it now with the same earnestness as I did then.

But I want to say that we now have the cart not in front of the horse but behind it, from the fact that another body has just passed a bill to open the coal mines of Alaska, and whatever value the coal up there may have, you will soon have before you a bill opening the way for its disposal, and giving an opportunity to haul away from there whatever coal there may be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], under the mistaken impression that he was casting odium upon an Illinois Republican, reads some letters about him asking for passes, and said it was a violation of the law. The latter statement is incorrect. There is no law in Illinois—at least there was none when these letters were written, and I do not know whether there is now in Illinois or not, but I think not—prohibiting the use of railway passes within the State. While I certainly do not admire the discretion of the person who wrote—

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment. While I do not admire the discretion or the good sense or the sense of propriety of the person who wrote the letter practically demanding passes, or really demanding passes under threat of legislative action, still he was not in conflict with the law passed in 1906 forbidding the giving of passes. Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will change the form of my question, because the gentleman has gone on. Would it not be in violation of the law if he were an interstate shipper?

Mr. MANN. He would not be violating the law unless he was an interstate shipper; and he was not a shipper, by the way. He is not a shipper at all; he is a State senator, a member of the Senate of Illinois. He did not violate the national law any more than Mr. Roosevelt did when he took a special train, and he did not violate the law, nor did he at the time violate the common practice.

I am not sure that I agree with the idea that there shall be no passes granted on the Alaska railroad. I wish it were possible that a majority of this House could be compelled to go to Alaska and have an opportunity of riding free upon a railroad or anything else owned by the Government there.

It would certainly add very much to the value of the information possessed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I took the floor not for the purpose of making those remarks but for the purpose of congratulating the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUSTON] upon the conference report which he brings in and upon the success which he has achieved in this legislation. [Applause.] The Alaska bill was under general debate in this House longer than any other bill not a great revenue bill, or an appropriation bill, or something of that sort has been debated since I have been a Member of the House. It received very careful consideration under the five-minute rule for amendment. It was materially changed in the House by way of amendment in some respects. The Senate had devoted a considerable time to the discussion of the measure, but very little in the way of amendment was inserted there which remains in the bill. Most of the amendments that were inserted in the House remain in the bill under the conference report. I am very glad that we have decided to build a railroad and pay for it out of the Treasury without resorting to bonds, while we still keep a separate account of all sorts of receipts from public lands or leases in Alaska, including any profits—ahem—from the operation of the railroad. I do not believe there will be any direct financial profit for years to come, so far as the railroad is concerned, but I do believe that the construction of this railroad in Alaska, even if it shall be only a short line, will aid greatly in the development of Alaska. Suppose the President only builds, in the first instance, a road from the sea to the coal fields, and we open up the coal fields and find out how far that coal can be utilized and sold and

burned on the Pacific side. We will have learned a great deal. Then, suppose we go ahead with a little further development, reaching here and there, and in the course of time—I apprehend not immediately—we construct \$35,000,000 worth of railroad. Probably by that time we will have learned enough to know whether we ought to increase the length of the road because of the industries or the development in Alaska. In my opinion, we could not retain Alaska as a possession or Territory of the United States without doing something toward its development, and we have reached the time when we must proceed, and I think it is a good thing to proceed along these lines. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the adoption of this conference report, and I rise only to make one observation. We have reached the last stage of one of the most important bills that this Congress has considered. It is the first great, important bill that this House, as a House of Representatives, has been permitted to consider upon the floor, and it has been demonstrated that as to any bill which does not in itself involve party or partisanship matters it is not necessary to hold a Democratic caucus and put through the bill under caucus rule. Every Member of this House will admit that this is a better bill to-day because both sides of this aisle have been free to offer amendments, and amendments have been considered upon their merits. That action has improved the bill, and we have a better bill than we would have had if you had attempted to legislate upon it through your Democratic caucus. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Is not that same statement true of the immigration bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon agreeing to the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HOUSTON a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 13679, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 5, page 3, I discover that there are two new places, called "lieutenants of the watch." I desire to ask the chairman of the committee the necessity for creating those two places.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture has 25 or 30 buildings to care for, and a number of watchmen are employed to take care of those buildings. It was thought better to designate two of these men as lieutenants of the watch; in other words, as foremen. There is no change whatever in the salaries of these two men. There is just simply a change of title, in order to give them the positions of foremen of the other watchmen.

Mr. FOWLER. How many new positions have been created under this paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. One clerk of class 1, two lieutenants of the watch at \$960—the men we are talking about—four watchmen at \$720, and two charwomen at \$240.

Mr. MADDEN. And there are three assistant messengers, are there not?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that those are transfers from other departments.

Mr. BOOHER. I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina if the duties of these lieutenants are the same?

Mr. LEVER. The duties are not exactly the same. Their duties will be to have supervision of certain messengers and watchmen under them. Their salaries are not increased at all. They are the same men who have been doing watchmen's service heretofore.

Mr. BOOHER. Is it not a fact that the duties of the lieutenants will be the same as those of the lieutenant who is getting \$1,000?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Then, why not pay these two lieutenants \$1,000 each, the same as you pay the other lieutenant, if they are performing the same duties?

Mr. LEVER. The committee followed the suggestion of the department, in order to do as the department wanted, and to keep up its line of promotion. If a vacancy occurs in the position of the \$1,000 lieutenant, by death or otherwise, there will be a line of promotion for those of less salary.

Mr. BOOHER. And the one who is promoted will receive the \$1,000 salary?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is it on a political subject?

Mr. WEBB. No; it is about a matter that arose here in the House last Saturday.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I do not usually notice newspaper reports of my conduct. However, I notice in this morning's Post these headlines:

May bar Army horses—WEBB would prohibit officers' mounts in shows—"Joker" slipped in the bill—North Carolina Member declares economy calls for cut in money allowed for exhibition—Chairman HAY, of the Military Committee, protests in vain—Prominent officer's view.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not true that this amendment was "slipped" in. It is not true that it is a "joker." I wish to read from the RECORD, page 4417, of last Saturday, when the amendment was agreed to:

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, on page 27, line 17, after the word "available," to add:

"And provided further, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended for defraying the expenses of officers, enlisted men, or horses in attending or taking part in horse shows."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will send his amendment to the desk.

Mr. HAY. I have no objection to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amend, page 27, line 17, after the word 'available,' by adding:

"And provided further, That hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation shall be expended for defraying the expenses of officers, enlisted men, or horses attending or taking part in horse shows."

And yet the newspaper states that it was put in over the protest of Mr. HAY. Mr. KAHN, the gentleman from California, debated this amendment and mildly resisted it, but finally the Committee of the Whole adopted it. So there is no "joker" about it; nor was it "slipped" in; it was done on the floor of the House, as the RECORD clearly shows. That is all I care to say. I will talk about the merits of the amendment later, because the "prominent Army officer" says that the transportation of Army officers, their horses and enlisted men to care for them, is a mere trifle. I will show in the debate later on that it is not a mere trifle, but that it is a tremendous and an unwarranted expense to the country. I want to keep the newspapers straight and not allow them to misrepresent me or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

For several years the Government has been paying large sums for transporting privately owned horses of officers to attend horse shows in the United States and even to Stockholm, Sweden. These horses are shipped in palace Arms cars, the mileage of the officers is paid at 7 cents per mile, their regular salary goes on, stallage for horses is paid, and the transportation of all enlisted men to take care of the horses is paid. There are four or five shows a year which officers and horses thus attend, from Denver, Colo., to New York City. I contend that there is no warrant of law for such expenditures, nor are such displays of official and equestrian vanity useful to the Army service. I estimate that we have been spending \$50,000 to \$75,000 yearly for such shows.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, the statement the gentleman from North Carolina has made, as to the amendment which he offered to the Army appropriation bill not being a joker, is absolutely correct. There was no joker about it. It is only fair to the gentleman to make such a statement. The gentleman offered his amendment and it was agreed to by the House. I called attention to the amendment. Personally I did not think it advisable to adopt it. Personally I do not think it applies to the section to which the gentleman offered it, and that practically it is of no legislative value as it now stands in the bill; but there was nothing in the nature of a joker about it.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman from California so stated at the time, but he understood the amendment fully, as did the committee.

Mr. MANN. I want to say that I had nothing to do with the newspaper article. As a matter of fact this matter has been proposed several times, and I have been successful in keeping it out, but I was not present at the time this amendment was adopted.

Mr. WEBB. The gentleman tried a year ago to prevent the knocking out of the polo shows, but he did not succeed. We knocked them out just as we are going to knock out horse shows.

Mr. MANN. He did succeed.

Mr. WEBB. It was done over the gentleman's protest.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I rather think that if there is any joker about the matter the joke is on the gentleman from North Carolina. The amendment should have been offered to the item which covers transportation for the Army, but the gentleman offered it at a place where it will not apply and it will do no harm.

Mr. WEBB. It evidently hit somebody, and particularly this "prominent Army officer," because he thinks the horse shows are ended unless the Senate rescues them. The amendment provides that "hereafter no part of this or any other appropriation" shall be used for horse shows, and so forth, and I think that covers whatever appropriation there is in the Army bill, and I am satisfied with it. My object was, however, to show to the House and the newspaper writer that there was no "joker" about it and that it was not "slipped" in, and that the newspaper report is entirely erroneous.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] asked if I had ever accepted free transportation from a railroad company, to which I replied I never had; and I said that when passes were offered to me I sent them back. I made a mistake, because only one pass was ever offered to me, and I did send that back.

I have been in Congress since 1902. I heard a great deal about the passes that were thrust on us. I have had but one offered to me, and that was from the Canadian Pacific Railway, accompanied by Sir Thomas O'Shaunessy's card. I sent it back, and I never was offered any other. I never was offered any when I was in the State legislature. I never accepted any here; and now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he ever accepted free transportation from a railroad company since he has been a Member of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am going to answer the question. The gentleman has an unfortunate habit of speaking for himself and also trying to speak for me. I acknowledge the gentleman's monumental virtue. I have sat for years with admiration for its magnitude. I did not suspect the gentleman had ever accepted transportation when I asked him the question. I thought probably he could answer as he did, that he never had. Now, I will answer the gentleman that since I have been a Member of Congress I have traveled on railroad transportation—

Mr. GARDNER. Free passes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Free passes. I will say to the gentleman that long before I came to Congress I traveled on free railroad transportation. As a newspaper man, I traveled on free railroad transportation for years. They were sent to the office, I suppose, on application; I did not apply to the railroad; I applied to the newspaper office. After I was elected to Congress, I received passes galore. I do not know that I have received one signed by one whose name started with "Sir," but I did have transportation free to a considerable extent sent me.

Mr. GARDNER. They knew that you were in the habit of receiving them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, I do not claim the gentleman's great virtue, but I do try to be frank with the gentleman and the House. Long before they passed a law here, which I hold in my hand, the law of 1906, I stopped using railroad transportation, because the light came to me that it was not right for Congressmen to use free transportation.

Mr. GARDNER. How about the owner of a newspaper?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, unlike the gentleman from Massachusetts, I was not born absolutely pure.

Mr. GARDNER. Did the gentleman carry railroad advertisements in his paper?

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, heavens, I do not know. I was engaged in the editorial side of my newspaper, and I do not suppose they did; but if they did they were paid for.

Mr. GARDNER. But the gentleman was in the habit of riding on free passes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly. When I came to Congress I traveled on passes, as most of the other Members did.



Mr. GARDNER. I am not a Progressive and I am not virtuous, but I never did.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, we all stand astonished at the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely pure and that he was born pure.

Mr. MANN. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that even the gentleman from Kansas was born pure.

Mr. MURDOCK. No; I do not think I was.

Mr. MANN. Though certainly he has not been since.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries, Weather Bureau: One chief of bureau, \$6,000; 1 chief clerk and executive assistant, \$3,000; 1 chief of division of stations and accounts, \$2,750; 1 chief of printing division, \$2,500; 3 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; 8 clerk, class 4; 11 clerks, class 3; 23 clerks, class 2; 30 clerks, class 1; 22 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 10 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,200; 1 assistant foreman of division, \$1,600; 1 chief compositor, \$1,400; 1 lithographer, \$1,500; 2 lithographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 pressman, \$1,200; 5 compositors, at \$1,250 each; 14 printers, at \$1,200 each; 11 printers, at \$1,000 each; 4 folders and feeders, at \$720 each; 1 chief instrument maker, \$1,400; 3 instrument makers, at \$1,200 each; 2 skilled mechanics, at \$1,200 each; 7 skilled mechanics, at \$1,000 each; 1 skilled mechanic, \$840; 1 skilled mechanic, \$720; 6 skilled artisans, at \$840 each; 1 engineer, \$1,300; 1 fireman and steam fitter, \$840; 5 firemen, at \$720 each; 1 captain of the watch, \$1,000; 1 electrician, \$1,200; 1 gardener, \$1,000; 4 repairmen, at \$840 each; 6 repairmen, at \$720 each; 4 watchmen, at \$720 each; 17 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$720 each; 6 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$660 each; 31 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$600 each; 88 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$480 each; 5 messengers, messenger boys, or laborers, at \$450 each; 27 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$360; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$328,270.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph. There are several new pieces of legislation in the paragraph and several increases of salary in violation of the statute; that is, the permanent law. I desire to direct my point of order against the increase in the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau. The statute fixes that salary at \$4,500, which is in the same category of places that were spoken of in the act of 1913. I do not desire to discuss the question.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit me I will call attention to the fact that the salary here is exactly the same for the fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order that there was an assistant chief of the bureau, which office was filled by Henry E. Williams, at a salary of \$3,250, and that there has been an effort in the bill to transfer him to the Division of Forecasting. I think it is proper to call the attention of the House to this question now, in order to save time.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make the point of order against that reduction, or does he intend to try to restore the language?

Mr. FOWLER. No; I am not complaining about the saving, because there is no saving. It is absolutely a changing of Henry E. Williams as Assistant Chief of the Weather Bureau into another division at a salary of \$3,250; and, so far as the saving in the salary is concerned, there is no saving whatever. Henry E. Williams was with Mr. Moore, the former chief of the bureau. He was one of the fellows who was in Mr. Moore's Landmore apartment-house scheme, a list of whose officials I hereby insert:

COPY OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION, RECORDER OF DEEDS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

[Landmore Apartment House Co., No. 6418, book 18, page 142. Received for record November 3, 1904.]

Object of incorporation: To acquire the property of the Landmore Apartment House Co. of Virginia, consisting of an apartment house in Washington, D. C., Twenty-fourth Street, between L and M Streets, NW, lot 10, in square 37, and to own, operate, manage, maintain, transfer, convey, sell, and mortgage the same.

Existence of corporation: Perpetual.

Capital stock: Fifty thousand dollars.

Shares: Five hundred, at a par value of \$100 each.

Directors of corporation for first year: Willis L. Moore, Frederick V. Coville, Henry E. Williams, Theodore Harding, Edgar B. Calvert, Elizabeth V. Coville.

Incorporators, all of whom are residents of the District of Columbia: Willis L. Moore, Frederick V. Coville, Henry E. Williams, Edgar B. Calvert, Theodore Harding, Elizabeth V. Coville.

Acknowledgement: Before D. J. Carroll, a notary in and for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman indicate what line that is?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois does not have anything before the House. He has not made a point of order, nor has he submitted an amendment.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have reserved the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman would point out the part of the paragraph to which he is directing his attention, the Chair will be obliged.

Mr. FOWLER. In line 16 there is an omission of the position of Assistant Chief of the Weather Bureau, which position was filled by Mr. Henry E. Williams. An effort has been made to transfer him to another department.

The CHAIRMAN. What the Chair would like to know is, Where does the gentleman from Illinois get the information that there is an attempt made to transfer him somewhere else?

Mr. FOWLER. I have looked into it, and know.

The CHAIRMAN. But it does not appear in this paragraph, does it?

Mr. FOWLER. The last bill carried a provision for an assistant to the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that the gentleman may understand the position of the Chair, does the gentleman make his point of order against a proposition that some position is left out of the paragraph?

Mr. FOWLER. No. I am calling the attention of the House now to this effort to make a change, in order that a point of order may be properly maintained at the proper place, if it is in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that there is absolutely nothing in this proposition to which the point of order could lie, because the gentleman is discussing something that is not in the bill at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman for a short time.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 17 there is a new position attempted to be created—one Chief of Division of Stations and Accounts, \$2,750. That is a new position entirely, not carried in the bill heretofore, as I recollect, and I have run the matter down and have marked it new. I make the point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order against that position?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unnecessary to argue that point. The Chair has already taken its position upon it, and I have nothing further to say.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly held here that where there is an effort to create a new office entirely distinct from what the bill has ever carried heretofore, it is subject to a point of order, and that has been the unanimous ruling of the Chair heretofore. I have interposed these points of order myself, and the Chair has uniformly sustained the point of order. This is not a position similar to a position heretofore held in this bureau, but it is the creation of a new place for a new man, to add new burdens to the taxpayers of the land, and I am trying to save the people these burdens, and these positions ought not to be created so promiscuously without some kind of authority of law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I do not care to discuss the point of order, because, as I said a moment ago, the Chair has already ruled on the proposition, but for the information of the gentleman from Illinois I desire to say that the position against which he is complaining is not the creation of a new place at all, and if it were it would not affect the point of order. It is a transfer, under authority of Congress and under the direction of Congress, of a man from the Division of Accounts and Disbursements to the Weather Bureau, at the same salary that he held in the Division of Disbursements and Accounts, and that appropriation is accordingly there reduced, as is set out very fully in my report. This man is not a new man, he has been doing this work for many years, and he has been located in the Weather Bureau and heretofore has been attached officially to the Division of Accounts and Disbursements, but Congress, through an act in 1912, I think, required that each bureau should do its own accounting, and that the Division of Accounts and Disbursements should hold only a revisionary accounting. It is not a new place; it does not increase the appropriation; it is only a transfer directed to be done under the law; and even if it were a new place it would not be subject to a point of order. I ask the Chair for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard any further?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I submit this is a new place, a creation of a new office, and my point of order ought to be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question. The Chair based his ruling a while ago on the proposition that there are certain details of organization in these different departments that must be left, necessarily, to the discretion of the heads of the departments in order that the work of the department may be carried on, but the Chair is somewhat reluctant to extend that ruling to posi-

tions other than subordinate detailed minor positions of the department. Now, the Chair desires to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill is this a new position which is being created?

Mr. LEVER. It is not a new position, but a transfer under the direction of law of a man who has heretofore been carried on the roll of the division of accounts and disbursements, but actually doing work in the Weather Bureau. I desire to call the attention of the Chair further to section 4 of the act creating the Weather Bureau, which provides:

That the Weather Bureau shall hereafter consist of one Chief of the Weather Bureau and such subordinate employees as Congress may annually provide for and as may be necessary to properly perform the duties involving on said bureau by law, and the Chief of the Weather Bureau shall receive, etc.

Clearly the statute that created the Weather Bureau gave Congress the right from time to time to afford it such employees as are necessary to carry out the work for which it is created. If the Chair desires to see this law, I will send it to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to have you send it up.

Mr. FOWLER. But, Mr. Chairman, that statute does not give Congress the right to create new positions.

Mr. LEVER. I want to say the gentleman's contention has this very remarkable effect: If the contention of the gentleman from Illinois is correct that the section of the Revised Statute which the Chair has before him does not give authority to Congress to create sufficient positions to carry on the necessary work of the Weather Bureau, then every single, solitary item of this statutory roll is subject to the point of order, except the item for the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau. It is just exactly in line undoubtedly with the ruling of the Chair this morning and with the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not quite agree with the gentleman from South Carolina on that proposition, and yet in the main the Chair thinks there is not much difference between us. This position would come, the Chair thinks, in another category from the class of employees we were considering a few moments ago, and the Chair wants to ask the gentleman this question: The Chair understood the gentleman to say a while ago that this same work has been done in the bureau by the same person and at the same salary, but perhaps under a different title. Is that true that it is only a change of title?

Mr. LEVER. It is not even a change of title. This work has heretofore been done in the Division of Accounts and Disbursements, but under an act of Congress the Division of Accounts and Disbursements was decentralized; and this man who has been doing this work, with his office located in the Weather Bureau, has been transferred from the roll of the Division of Disbursements and Accounts to the roll of the Weather Bureau, doing precisely the same work.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is the point the Chair desired to have made clear. The Chair understood the gentleman at first to make that statement. If that be true, there is really no new position created; and, therefore, the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, in line 24 there is a new office created—one pressman, at \$1,200. I make the point of order against it as being new matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled for the same reason that the Chairman gave a moment ago.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, line 2, there is one chief instrument maker, at \$1,400—a new position—and it is a chief position.

Mr. LEVER. I would say to the Chair that this is only a change of title. It is "one chief instrument maker" in lieu of "one chief mechanic," at \$1,400. The salary is exactly the same, the work is the same, and the man is the same. The only thing we did here was to try to set out more distinctly and accurately his line of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the chairman of this committee has relied upon the act of 1913—the two-line-and-a-half provision—for the salaries of this bureau. Now, he is bringing in at the very next session of Congress an increase to that force by creating new places and then contending that, because they may have been carried somewhere else, they are not new places. "Somewhere else" was a place where a man had no duty to perform and was compelled to get out. "Now" is a new place created in this bureau for the purpose of taking care of him. That is what this case is.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, the gentleman is making a statement which, I trust, he ought to know does not state the facts, because I

tried to state to the gentleman as plainly as I knew how to use the English language to convey my thoughts that this was the same man at the same salary and doing the same work, and that it was only a change of title. I hope the gentleman will not so far forget himself as to impugn my veracity as to a statement upon the facts in this bill. The "gentleman from South Carolina" is not given to doing that kind of work, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOWLER. The gentleman from South Carolina has the respect of the "gentleman from Illinois."

Mr. LEVER. I believe that, and I am proud of it.

Mr. FOWLER. Repeatedly so. But I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that I have gone into this bill with some degree of care, the same as he has.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman deny the truth of the statement I make that this is nothing but a change of title?

Mr. FOWLER. I say that this place was not provided for in the last bill.

Mr. LEVER. It is exactly the same place, except we call him by a different name. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

Mr. FOWLER. That is one of the ways the appropriation committees have had in the past to create new offices, and then reinstated the old fellow under the old title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has overruled the point of order on that proposition and it is not necessary to take up any more time on it.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, Mr. Chairman, in line 3, there is the item "3 instrument makers"—new material and new places, and at \$1,200 each.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the same explanation, exactly, applies to that as applies to the item above. They are three instrument makers, at \$1,200 each, in lieu of three skilled mechanics, at \$1,200 each. In other words, the department desired to change the title of these men in order more clearly to express the character of work they are doing. They are the same men, doing the same character of work.

Mr. FOWLER. And then you will come along at the next session of Congress and ask that the three skilled mechanics be reinstated.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will trust me not to do that.

Mr. FOWLER. That was what was done with the law clerk and solicitor, and you made 21 law clerks instead of 1 law clerk two years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOWLER. On page 4, line 9, is a new place; not exactly a new place, but an increase in the salary over the salary of last year of a gardener. The word "gardener" is a misnomer. He is nothing but a lawn mower, and if they would change the title to that of "lawn mower" and give him \$1,200 a year I would be satisfied with it, and I hope the gentleman will see proper in the next bill to properly name this man.

Mr. LEVER. I am afraid the gentleman would make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] make a point of order against this item?

Mr. FOWLER. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not desire to make a point of order on that.

I desire also to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that he is not a gardener, but just a lawn mower?

Mr. LEVER. It is not a fact.

Mr. FOWLER. What garden work does he do?

Mr. LEVER. Here is what is disclosed in the hearings:

Mr. CALVERT. That gardener is a remarkable man. Without any assistant whatever, he takes care of all the ground and flower beds about the Weather Bureau premises. He does it in a manner that is highly creditable.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How much ground have you?

Mr. FOWLER. It is about a quarter of an acre?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know. I have not stepped it off myself. I will read further:

Mr. CALVERT. I can not say. It is probably an acre or a little bit more; but it is so cut up that it involves a considerable amount of work.

Mr. HAUGEN. You have more than a block, haven't you?

Mr. CALVERT. We have only a little more than a fourth of a block. It is a very large block. It is the same block in which the Columbia Hospital is located.

Mr. SLOAN. How long has he been gardener?

Mr. CALVERT. I do not recall exactly, but I should say five years.

The CHAIRMAN. Has he had an increase of salary since he came into the service?

Prof. BOWIE. He had an increase of \$10 a month last year.

Dr. GALLOWAY. Mr. Chairman, last year there was a general increase of salaries of gardeners in the department. That was made without any estimates being submitted, and about 15 or 20 gardeners had their salaries increased.

The CHAIRMAN. How does this salary compare with the other gardeners of the department?



Dr. GALLOWAY. It is less. Some of the gardeners receive salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$1,400.

The CHAIRMAN. For the same kind of work?

Dr. GALLOWAY. No; the high-class men doing propagating work, of course, are paid the higher salaries.

Mr. FOWLER. The only thing I am complaining about—

Mr. LEVER. Now, that is all the information I have.

Mr. FOWLER. However, he is nothing but a lawn mower.

Mr. LEVER. Then the gentleman has more information than has the department official.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Weather Bureau: For carrying into effect in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States, in the West Indies, and on adjacent coasts, in the Hawaiian Islands, in Bermuda, and in Alaska, the provisions of an act approved October 1, 1890, so far as they relate to the weather service transferred thereby to the Department of Agriculture; for the employment of professors of meteorology, district forecasters, local forecasters, meteorologists, section directors, observers, assistant observers, operators, skilled mechanics, instrument makers, assistant foremen, proof readers, compositors, pressmen, lithographers, folders and feeders, repairmen, station agents, messengers, messenger boys, laborers, special observers, display men, and other necessary employees; for fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, ice, dry goods, twine, mats, oils, paints, glass, lumber, hardware, and washing towels; for advertising; for subsistence, care, and purchase of horses and vehicles, and repairs of harness, for official purposes only; for instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers and repairs thereto; for rent of offices; for repairs and improvements to existing buildings and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary out-buildings and sidewalks on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds; and the erection of temporary buildings for living quarters of observers; for official traveling expenses; for telephone rentals and for telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreements with the companies performing the service; for the maintenance and repair of Weather Bureau telegraph, telephone, and cable lines; and for every other expenditure required for the establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations and for the issuing of weather forecasts and warnings of storms, cold waves, frosts, and heavy snows, the gauging and measuring of the flow of rivers and the issuing of river forecasts and warnings; for observations and reports relating to crops and for other necessary observations and reports, including cooperation with other bureaus of the Government and societies and institutions of learning for the dissemination of meteorological information, as follows:

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. Will this bill be read by paragraphs or by sections?

The CHAIRMAN. It is read by paragraphs. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses in the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, \$122,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, for the first time, as I recollect, in the history of the Weather Bureau, a new term has crept in, namely "seismology," and I desire to make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman reserve it?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I desire to say this: The Department of Agriculture for a number of years has been requesting the Committee on Agriculture to include that language in the bill. Up to 1913 the department, in fact, through its Weather Bureau, was doing seismological work, but the Comptroller of the Treasury held that there was no authority under the law for the Weather Bureau to do it. The committee, however, held that inasmuch as we have opened the Panama Canal, and inasmuch as we were continuing to build higher and higher structures, and in the West to erect drainage canals and irrigation canals, and with the evidence before us of the value of information as to just where the earth fissures were, probably this would be a rather good investment.

I want to call your attention to the statement of President John C. Banner, of Stanford University, made on December 13, 1913:

[From the Star, Washington, D. C., Sunday, December 14.]

EARTHQUAKE SHOCK CALIFORNIA PUZZLE—STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT DECLARES THERE IS "CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE"—GLARING NEED OF DATA IN PANAMA CANAL ZONE—THINKS WHOLE PROBLEM SHOULD BE PART OF DUTIES OF THE WEATHER BUREAU HERE.

SAN FRANCISCO, December 13.

There is an "earthquake problem" in this country, according to President John C. Branner, of Stanford University, and it can and ought to be coped with in the same way that a business problem or a pestilence would be met.

In a speech here to-day he spoke deprecatingly of the "conspiracy of silence," which he said had hindered a scientific and sane study of the "active faults" in the earth's crust in California which would make possible a campaign against a repetition of the disaster of 1906.

"We must study quakes, where they originate, how and why," he said. "Our study of the 1906 earthquake enabled us to map out the

entire distance of the fault which caused the damage—the fracture of the earth's crust which slipped and caused the tremble.

#### WORKING TO LOCATE FAULTS.

"There are plenty of active faults in California, and we should be working now to locate them. When we know where they are we can keep our houses, bridges, dams, pipe lines, and other structures off them, or we can do our engineering so that when the next earth slip comes the effect will be negligible.

"If the wriggling line of the 1906 fault had been accurately known the Spring Valley Water Co. would not have had its pipe line laid over it, the water would not have been shut off, and this city would not have been destroyed.

"In projecting the great Hetch Hetchy municipal water system to this city, Engineer Freeman asked my advice as consulting geologist. I pointed out that near Clivington the line would have to cross an active fault, which sooner or later would shift and cause a break in the line. Freeman proposes to remedy this by constructing a valve above the fault and erecting a repair station near by.

#### LOS ANGELES AFFECTED.

"In the enormously long and expensive pipe lines which Los Angeles has built from Owens Valley it has been impossible to avoid crossing an active fault, which in time will cause a break. The city of Los Angeles has sought to minimize the danger by constructing a huge reservoir and repair facilities near by.

"In the Panama Canal Zone there is a glaring example of the need of gathering earthquake data. At present it is evident that there is no intelligent study and the engineers are working in the dark.

"This whole problem should be under Government supervision. Economically, it should be a part of the duties of the Weather Bureau. In due time the comparison and tabulation of information on all quakes would give us a working knowledge of all menacing faults, and we could guard against their damaging effects."

#### I read the following memorandum:

##### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

##### WEATHER BUREAU, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF,

Washington, D. C., December 16, 1913.

##### MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY ON THE SUBJECT OF SEISMOLOGY AND THE WEATHER BUREAU.

DEAR DR. GALLOWAY: I wish to ask your attention to the enclosed clipping from the Washington Sunday Star of December 14, wherein Dr. Branner, president of the Leland Stanford University, points out the great need of seismological work, especially in California and the Canal Zone, and incidentally states that, economically, this work should be a part of the duties of the Weather Bureau. I hope you will bring this matter to the attention of Mr. LEVER not only because the Weather Bureau estimates contain the authority to engage in seismological observations, but because I made it the subject of special remarks in connection with our estimates for taking up forecast work in the Caribbean Sea and the Canal Zone. Both aspects of the matter are touched upon by President Branner, who is one of the foremost students of the great problems of seismology confronting residents and engineers of California.

Very respectfully,

C. F. MARVIN, Chief of Bureau.

I want to call my friend's attention to the further fact that the United States is the only great Government on the face of this earth that is not doing seismological work. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman. The language is subject to a point of order. But the committee recognized that when it put it in the bill, but we thought that the matter was of such importance and that the cost of doing it is so little—\$10,000 is the estimate—and it does not increase the sum heretofore carried in this bill for the purposes of the Weather Bureau. They are going to take it out of something else if we should allow it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. LEVER. I do.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the insertion of this word involve any increase in the amount of the appropriation in this item or in any other item?

Mr. LEVER. It involves no increase in the funds for the present fiscal year, but of the funds provided in this bill from eight to ten thousand dollars will be used in this work. In other words, let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota, all we need to do is to purchase a few of these instruments which record the movement of the earth. For instance, the other night in the great storm we had the seismological instrument that they have at the Georgetown University described distinctly the motion of the earth under the tremendous pressure above it. The Weather Bureau officials are capable of doing this work. All we need to do now is to provide them with a few instruments, and in the future only a small sum of money will be needed to keep up with that work.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand the department is now doing this work, but that the Comptroller of the Treasury has held that they had no authority to do it.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. The comptroller said they had no authority. I concede the gentleman's point of order, if he makes it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know if there is any handle upon which to hang this appropriation in order to make it in order? I desire to ask if the other matters carried in the paragraph are authorized by existing law? If they are, then this whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, and the point of order being made to one item only, under the familiar rule this item would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I contend and absolutely believe that the other items are not subject to a point of order. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] will not make his point of order, because I know this will be very valuable work.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that seismology has any more connection with astronomy than the forest fires that originate in Canada; none whatever. If we embark on the study of seismology in the Agricultural Department, it undoubtedly will carry us adrift.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a minute?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; in a moment. The great pressure that will be brought to bear upon the committee and upon Congress was indicated by the distinguished chairman of this committee when he said that in the region of the Panama Canal there is an earthquake zone. That will be brought with the greatest force on earth before Congress for future appropriations, and I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that if we place in the scope of the authority of the Agricultural Department seismology it will cost the United States more than the digging of the Panama Canal. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, seismology, evaporation, and aerology, \$1,189,000, including not to exceed \$591,000 for salaries, \$120,000 for special observations and reports, \$275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and \$30,000 for traveling expenses.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. It is a change of existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that point of order is well taken. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to what the committee is undertaking to do in this rearrangement of the language of this bureau.

This language under general expenses under the Weather Bureau has been a matter of a good deal of attention on the part of the committee for several years. Heretofore the bureau has been doing its work upon a basis absolutely different from that of any other bureau of the Department of Agriculture. In the estimates the department submitted certain language, rearranging the old language of the bill, but conferring no new authority upon the bureau. The Committee on Agriculture was not entirely satisfied with the language submitted, and we had the department submit other language time and time again until we found such language as we thought would meet the situation.

Heretofore the Weather Bureau has been doing its work on the line of the material used rather than upon the basis of projects. In other words, if you were building a house, what you would be interested in would be the total cost of the house. Now, the Weather Bureau heretofore has been submitting its estimates not upon projects but upon how much the brick in the house will cost; how much the laths will cost; how much the cement will cost; how much the doors will cost; how much the labor will cost, and the like of that. I do not know that this arrangement is the very best we can get ultimately, but what we want to do is to put the Weather Bureau on a project basis, just as the other bureaus of the department now are.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that in last year's appropriation act you segregated much more specifically than you have in this bill as to the various provisions. One of those items, carrying an appropriation of \$590,500, was for the employment of professors, meteorological inspectors, and the like. In the phraseology which is submitted by the committee in the present bill there is no language authorizing the employment specifically of professors for the purposes herein indicated. Does the gentleman think, or does the committee believe, that it is good legislation to combine under general authority and give the department wide discretion in the expenditure of the appropriation, or whether, as some other committees believe, it is better policy to segregate the items as far as possible?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that as a general proposition I believe the more we can segregate these items the better.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman point out wherein he would place any limitation whatsoever on the activities of the Weather Bureau in the employment of professors of these various kinds, if there is no limitation as to the amount that can be expended?

Mr. LEVER. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 6, line 19:

Including not to exceed \$591,000 for salaries.

That is the limitation. As I said a moment ago, what we are trying to do is to get the Weather Bureau on a project basis, and hence we have divided it up in this way—so much in the city of Washington, so much outside of the city of Washington, so much for the maintenance of a printing office, and so much for the erection of buildings. But you will notice that in that second division we have put limitations and divided that up. While it carries a total of \$1,189,000, not to exceed \$591,000 is to be used for salaries, \$120,000 for special observations and reports, \$275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and \$30,000 for traveling expenses. In other words, when it comes right down to bedrock, we have more nearly segregated the items here than in the old bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take the contrary position, because under the general phraseology "for necessary expenses," that might include employment of services that would not be considered strictly as salaries. I address the inquiry in all good faith to the chairman, whether he thinks that in the preparation of future bills the Weather Bureau will be held to as strict an account when you lump these items together, as in the former bills, when we had separate paragraphs in which they were limited specifically to the various kinds of work that they might do?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture is required to file a detailed statement with Congress as to the lines of expenditure, and the Committee on Agriculture never makes up one of these bills without looking very carefully into that.

Now, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to a specific case which illustrates how necessary it is that we get upon a project basis, and not upon a material basis, as it were. In other words, here is one man who is doing a number of lines of work, and yet he must keep a separate account of how many hours he puts upon climatology, how many hours upon meteorology, how much fuel is used while he is devoting his time to climatology, how much gas is used while he is devoting his time to sending out forecast warnings. It was the thought of the committee that if we could place this upon a project basis, in the future we would be able to keep such a hand upon it that we could actually effect a real economy in the work of the Weather Bureau, and that is the thought of the Department of Agriculture in its rearrangement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I direct the gentleman's further attention to some other segregated items in last year's appropriation act:

For fuel, gas, electricity, freight and express charges, furniture, stationery, and all other necessary supplies and miscellaneous expenses, \$106,500.

That item is not segregated in any way in this general omnibus provision.

Mr. LEVER. For the very reason I suggest. Here is a man who is in charge of climatological work, in charge of meteorological work, in charge of the issuing of flood warnings, in charge of the issuing of forecasts. All these things are done by the same man.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would not the gentleman's reasoning apply to every other department?

Mr. LEVER. To some extent; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. He is in the same bureau?

Mr. LEVER. But this man, doing this work, is required to keep a separate account against every line of work he is doing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not under these segregated items for fuel and materials used.

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Congress is surrendering supervision as to the amount that may be expended for these different items. I will take the following item in last year's appropriation act:

For instruments, shelters, apparatus, storm-warning towers, and repairs thereto, \$43,500.

Where is there any such segregated item in this general omnibus paragraph that the committee reports?

Mr. LEVER. That is carried for necessary expenses outside of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under "necessary expenses" you are leaving to the control of the department the expenditure of money and surrendering the control of Congress over limitations.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question.

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado.



Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is not Congress entitled to know the expenditures of each station outside of Washington?

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been the policy of Congress to segregate as far as practicable every item that it was possible to segregate. For years and years Members have been trying to have the appropriations in the Agricultural bill segregated. For years the bill came in without much segregation, but after a while Members made an attack on that plan and the committee in a subsequent Congress then revised and segregated it somewhat. Now, I am fearful that the committee is going back to that old way of surrendering the authority to the department. Politics has nothing to do with this question; but in past administrations abuses grew up in the Agricultural Department which had their seat in the fact that there was no limitation on the expenditures of the vast sums of money that were committed to the discretion of the various bureau heads. I believe in segregation. We all know that every person at the head of a bureau has a hobby, and how they always try to emphasize the importance of their special work by extending in all possible directions if there is no limitation on their power or on the separate amount that may be expended.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call my friend's attention to this fact: The Secretary of Agriculture appointed a committee from his department to go into the matter and reorganize the Weather Bureau, put it on a project basis in keeping with the line of work of the various other bureaus of the department. That committee, as I suggested a moment ago, submitted the language which the gentleman will see in the items. The committee did not believe that it carried out the purpose that the gentleman is now suggesting, the segregation of these items, to such an extent as would meet the will of Congress. Hence we sent back to them for additional segregation of these items. The result was that they brought to us this language which we offer, which I went over very carefully to see that there was no new authority slipped in, and which the committee likewise did, and we believe that we are beginning—we may not have accomplished it yet—but we believe we have set out to place the Weather Bureau on a project basis so that hereafter Congress will know exactly how the money is being spent.

There are 202 principal weather bureau stations. We would like to know how much money we are spending. There is not a line in the old bill that will designate that proposition or indicate how and where it is spent, but we can do it under this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman point out under this item as it is framed how much money will be spent for instruments, shelter, and apparatus?

Mr. LEVER. Of the \$1,189,000 there is not to exceed \$591,000 for salaries; that is to be expended outside the city of Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there any provision that restricts the expenditure for instruments?

Mr. LEVER. The bill says not to exceed \$120,000 for special observations and reports, \$275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and \$30,000 for traveling expenses.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but where is there any limitation upon what should be expended for instruments? That was segregated in the last year's appropriation bill.

Mr. LEVER. There is not anything as to instruments, but I call attention to this fact, that it would be impossible to segregate that amount without doing what we do not want to do—going back to the old line of appropriation.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. All the items covered in this paragraph have been provided for in previous bills under a different form of language?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. If my friend will look at the old language and read it with the new language he will find that there is not a word of new language in this bill that was not in the old bill, except the word "seismology," which my friend from Illinois, Mr. FOWLER, had excluded on a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. The thing that occurred to me was that it had been the policy of the House in the past, as far as possible, to itemize the different appropriations for the various activities of each department.

Mr. LEVER. And the committee is in line with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I am afraid the language used in this paragraph departs from that practice and goes back to a policy which was in existence before the beginning of the system which itemized the statements and expenses in the various bureaus of the different departments of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. The committee, on the contrary, believes that we are beginning—we may not have accomplished it fully in this bill, because it is the first time we have attempted it—but

we believe that this is the beginning of such segregation as the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, there are \$591,000 that may be used in this paragraph for salaries. My thought was, and is, that we ought to state the number of men to be employed, the salaries to be paid, and the duties to be performed. But under this method of appropriation we yield all of that to the judgment of the head of the department, and we leave it to him to say whether he shall employ 100 men at \$200 a month each or whether he shall employ 200 men at \$100 a month.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will understand that the scientific employees have always been carried in a lump sum, while the clerks, pure and simple, are carried on the statutory roll under act of Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Are not clerks paid out of this item?

Mr. LEVER. These are all scientific men. I want to call attention to a statement I have in my hand showing that the committee is informed of the names of these men, the salaries that are paid to them, where they are located, and so forth, 55 pages of it.

Mr. MADDEN. The only thing that prompted me to raise the point of order was the doubt as to whether or not we were not departing from the custom that we have heretofore adhered to and yielding up all of our authority to the heads of the department.

Mr. LEVER. It was the earnest intention of the committee to work in the very direction which has been outlined by the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and the gentleman from Minnesota. If we have not succeeded, we do believe that we have begun a start which will end in such a setting out of the items in our bill as will put Congress in full possession of the amount expended in the various lines of work.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course I have no disposition to make the point of order if there is no reason why it should be made.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order, but his colleague [Mr. FOWLER] reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I feel quite sure that certain portions of the language in that paragraph ought to be stricken out. For instance, the word "seismology" ought to be stricken out, in harmony with the ruling of the Chair a short time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair presumes the chairman of the committee will concede that. The gentleman from Illinois raises the point that in this paragraph the word "seismology," in harmony with the ruling a while ago, ought to go out.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing that that should go out.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course, Mr. Chairman, that would carry the entire paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Illinois to make the point of order against the word "seismology," on page 6, line 18?

Mr. FOWLER. I have not done that yet.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "seismology" may be stricken out.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to yield the floor.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I thought the gentleman just wanted to get that word out.

Mr. FOWLER. No. Mr. Chairman, there are other features in this paragraph than that of seismology that are objectionable, and I desire to point some of them out. The distinguished chairman of this committee is always frank and generous. I know he never makes a mistake unless it is purely a mistake, and does not intentionally at any time, I believe, try to deceive this House. I could not pay a higher tribute to any other man in the House than he is deserving of, but as he has well said, he is not the Committee on Agriculture, but only a member of it and its chairman, and he stands like other chairmen of committees. He is dependent upon the information which he receives from the Secretary and chiefs of bureaus and those who may be connected with important parts of the work. Mr. Chairman, there is one feature of this paragraph that to my way of thinking is absolutely horrible, and that is the lump-sum appropriation of \$591,000. This appropriation is made for an alibi. There is not a single man in this bill for which any of this money is to be appropriated. If he were charged with an offense and wanted to interpose a plea of alibi, he could successfully maintain his position and be acquitted. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice for a goodly number of years to appropriate lump sums. In 1900 the lump sum was something like \$380,000, but since that time we have seen it almost double itself, and there ought to be a change made some time, so that

Congress would know for what purpose the appropriations are being made. There is a statute providing that this force of laborers, skilled laborers, or professional men, as the case may be, can not be paid above \$3,500. There is a provision in this bill to extend that to \$4,500.

Mr. LEVER. It is \$4,000 at the present time, and the provision is to extend it to \$4,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the chairman of the committee that the law now is \$4,000, but I had understood it to be \$3,500; I may be mistaken. There is a provision in this bill proposing to raise that limit to \$4,500. Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a list of 465 employees whose salaries are fixed solely by the chiefs, or by the Chief of the Weather Bureau, which I desire to extend in the Record.

*Weather Bureau employees on miscellaneous roll of "General expenses, Weather Bureau, station salaries."*

Professors of meteorology (\$3,500): H. J. Cox, H. C. Frankfield, A. J. Henry, A. G. McAdie, C. F. Marvin. Total (5), \$17,500.  
Professor of meteorological physics (\$3,500): W. J. Humphreys. Total (1), \$3,500.

Professors of meteorology (\$3,000): C. Abbe, H. L. Heiskell (on furlough until further orders), J. Warren Smith (on furlough until further orders). Total (3), \$9,000.

Professors of meteorology (\$2,500): O. L. Fassig, H. H. Kimball, F. J. Walz, W. M. Wilson. Total (4), \$10,000.

Junior professors of meteorology (\$2,400): W. R. Blair, C. F. Talman. Total (2), \$4,800.

District forecaster (\$3,000): E. H. Bowie. Total (1), \$3,000.

Inspectors (\$3,000): N. B. Conger (on furlough until further orders), H. B. Hersey (on furlough until further orders). Total (2), \$6,000.

Climatologist and chief of division (\$2,500): P. C. Day. Total (1), \$2,500.

District forecasters (\$2,400): E. A. Beals, F. H. Brandenburg, I. M. Cline, D. Cuthbertson, M. W. Hayes, J. H. Scarr, J. W. Smith. Total (7), \$16,800.

Local forecaster (\$2,400): W. G. Burns. Total (1), \$2,400.

Local forecasters (\$2,000): W. H. Alexander, F. A. Carpenter, P. Connor, W. C. Devereaux, E. H. Emery, H. Pennywitt, G. T. Todd. Total (7), \$14,000.

Section directors (\$2,000): G. S. Bliss, B. Bunnemeyer, A. J. Mitchell, U. G. Purcell, C. F. Schneider, C. F. von Herrmann. Total (6), \$12,000.

Local forecasters (\$1,800): A. Ashenberger, L. H. Daingerfield, L. M. Day, S. C. Emery, H. O. Geren, W. S. Palmer, C. D. Reed, J. M. Sherier, J. H. Spencer, C. M. Strong, L. M. Tarr, J. R. Weeks, L. A. Welsh, G. H. Willson. Total (14), \$25,200.

Section directors (\$1,800): H. F. Alcintore, V. H. Church, E. A. Evans, R. Nunn, G. A. Loveland, G. N. Salisbury, P. H. Smyth, W. B. Stockman, A. H. Thiessen, R. F. Young. Total (10), \$18,000.

Local forecasters (\$1,600): H. F. Alps, J. H. Armstrong, W. S. Belden, M. E. Byrstone, H. B. Boyer, A. Brand, A. Buell, L. C. Cover, W. S. Currier, E. R. Demain, C. J. Doherty, L. J. Guthrie, J. K. Hooper, E. P. Jones, W. W. Neffert, E. S. Nichols, E. H. Nimmo, G. H. Noyes, J. N. Hyker, M. R. Sanford, J. H. Scott, C. Stewart, W. P. Stewart, R. H. Sullivan, C. D. C. Thompson, J. F. Voorhees, G. B. Wurtz. Total (16), \$25,600.

Section directors (\$1,600): W. E. Barron, L. A. Denson, S. W. Glenn, R. Q. Grant, F. E. Hartwell, H. C. Howe, T. B. Jennings, R. E. Pollock (on furlough until further orders), G. Reeder, O. W. Roberts, J. F. Slaughter, E. L. Wells. Total (12), \$19,200.

Local forecasters (\$1,400): O. O. Atto, A. H. Bell, W. E. Bonnett, T. L. Bridges, W. R. Cade, J. F. Drake, W. M. Dudley, E. D. Emigh, M. L. W. Cronk, W. L. Day, T. F. Drake, W. M. Dudley, E. D. Emigh, M. L. Fuller, R. W. Gray, R. M. Hardinge, J. S. Hazen, F. Jernin, B. C. Kadel, J. M. Kirk, D. S. Landis, G. S. Lindgren, R. T. Lindley, P. McDonough, G. W. McDowell, E. H. W. Richardson, D. A. Seeley, W. A. Shaw, M. B. Summers, N. R. Taylor, E. C. Vose, B. L. Waldron, G. N. Wilson, C. S. Wood. Total (39), \$54,400.

Local forecasters (\$1,200): W. J. Bennett, A. G. Burns, E. C. Horton, L. G. Sutton, E. C. Thompson. Total (5), \$6,000.

Section directors (\$1,400): R. R. Briggs, H. S. Cole, C. E. Linney, C. J. Root. Total (4), \$5,600.

Observers (\$1,400): G. J. O'Connor. Total (1), \$1,400.

Observers (\$1,200): J. C. Alter, R. L. Anderson, J. D. Blagden, T. A. Blair, F. W. Brist, A. L. Brockway, W. S. Brozman, J. W. Byram, C. C. Callin, H. G. Carter, H. T. Collman, M. Connell, F. W. Conrad, H. B. Cowdrick, J. Craig, A. W. Crosby, N. M. Cunningham, T. F. Davis, W. Davis, F. L. Disterdick, C. A. Donnel, R. A. Dyke, C. H. Eshleman, W. H. Fallon, G. W. Felger, C. E. Faulhaber, L. C. Fisher, J. Fitzgerald, S. D. Flora, W. D. Fuller, C. C. Garrett, F. Gillam, E. B. Gittings, Jr., F. Z. Gosewisch, W. H. Gregg, G. K. Greening, Jr., J. Grover, D. C. Grunow (on furlough for a longer period than three months), O. M. Hadley, E. H. Haines, W. E. Hare, G. Hass-Hagen, J. E. Hutchison, V. E. Jaki, H. A. Jones, L. A. Judkins, J. L. Kendall, H. E. Kichline, J. H. Kimball, G. W. Lady, N. D. Lane, W. T. Lathrop, G. E. Lawton, J. G. Linsley, L. Lodholz, D. P. McCallum, A. F. Macrum, H. A. Marks, G. W. Minding, C. L. Mitchell, R. C. Mize, D. R. Morris, S. L. Mosby, D. C. Murphy, C. E. Norquest, H. B. Patrick, S. P. Peterson, J. C. Piercy, R. P. Powell, A. W. Pugh, W. J. Reed, W. W. Reed, C. H. Richardson, M. V. Robins, H. H. Roche, E. E. Row, G. V. Sager, J. W. Schaeffer, W. B. Schlomer, W. H. Scholl, B. J. Sherry, R. W. Smith, H. H. Spindler, M. Sprague, M. B. Stubbs, T. R. Taylor, W. W. Thomas, A. R. Thorson, H. Tullsen, J. L. Vanderpool, J. I. Widmeyer, A. Wiesner, J. R. Williams, H. M. Willis. Total (94), \$112,800.

Section director (\$1,000): G. M. Chappel. Total (1), \$1,000.

Observers (\$1,000): W. Bailey, H. McP. Baldwin, W. Bell, T. J. Conside, H. B. Dick, R. L. Fisher, H. A. Frise, W. H. Green, G. E. Grimes, S. Hackett, H. P. Hardin, H. K. Holcomb, M. R. Hovde, J. J. Kelliher, C. W. Ling, E. W. McGann, W. U. Simons, R. M. Williamson, M. Wright. Total (19), \$19,000.

Assistant observers (\$1,000): H. J. Andree, E. C. Band, Jr., J. Billy, Jr., D. Blake, L. W. Blanchard, W. R. Borman, E. T. Burns, L. W. Carroll, R. E. Clark, W. F. Clark, F. T. Cole, M. S. Collom, F. S. Cushing, A. J. Davis, R. H. Dean, C. Dill, L. Dorman, S. L. Doshier, M. W. Dow, J. A. Dusseault, M. C. Faulk, E. L. Felton, D. Fisher, J. S. Gar-

rasen, E. J. Glass, C. C. Grant, H. C. Gross, C. Hallenbeck, H. G. Harp, J. C. Hayden, C. E. Heckathorn, P. Hess, M. S. Howard, H. M. Howell, H. E. Hyre, J. H. Jaqua, H. N. Johnson, W. Johnstone, J. Jones, A. A. Justice, E. E. Lanning, E. G. Larson, B. R. Laskowski, O. T. Lay, H. Legler, O. L. Lewis, D. M. Lillie, J. B. Lockwood, H. W. McKenzie, F. E. McLeary, F. A. Math, H. H. Martin, W. D. Maxwell, K. Meaker, G. C. Merchant, H. C. Metcalf, E. M. Minehart, O. E. Moery, M. T. Nesmith, J. J. O'Donnell, E. J. Olsen, E. Peterman, G. W. Pittman, T. R. Reed, M. A. Rice, O. R. Rogers, J. E. Sanders, A. H. Scott, R. M. Shaver, A. W. Shilling, T. G. Shipman, J. B. Sloan, O. D. Stewart, A. R. Teepie, R. W. Thomas, W. H. Tracy, G. E. Turner, H. E. Vall, O. Whitman, B. B. Whittier, J. B. Wilson, C. A. Woodworth, W. L. Wyland, E. E. Yeager (on furlough for a longer period than 3 months). Total (84), \$84,000.

Assistant observers (\$900): F. H. Ackelov, F. H. Ahearn, C. G. Andrus, C. D. Asher, W. Atkins, R. A. Barrie, F. J. Bavendick, C. A. Belt, H. C. Berger, G. J. Brands, T. R. Brooks, E. A. Brown, L. M. Campfield, A. A. Catterall, T. J. Chancellor, L. T. Chapel, E. G. Connor, M. E. Conway, S. R. Creider, L. L. Criswell, C. I. Dague, J. Daily, C. R. Davenport, W. P. Day, S. Deitch, R. M. Dole, G. W. Eddy, A. F. Fankhauser, W. F. Feldwisch, R. H. Finch, T. D. Firestone, J. C. Fisher, Jr., E. H. Fletcher, G. D. Frost, T. Gibson, J. H. Gordon, C. E. Hadley, L. Hagen, W. C. Haines, C. C. Hamme, O. H. Hammonds, I. F. Hand, P. R. Hathaway, D. B. Hayes, H. M. Highman, H. D. Helby, H. E. Heyer, P. R. Hill, C. T. Hillmers, E. W. Holcombe, W. H. Hossler, H. B. Hovde, P. E. Johnson, E. H. Jones, T. J. Jordan, J. F. Jungermann, L. H. Junken, A. G. J. Kautz, H. B. Lake, A. S. Lane, C. S. Ling, F. Long, W. McDonald, P. G. McGinnis, M. M. Maguire, W. Mahaffy, M. F. Marsh, E. E. Mendley, F. I. Moses, R. L. Murdock, L. A. Murphy, W. A. Oates, C. B. Odenweller, O. Parker, W. H. Parker, H. L. Pugh, J. W. Raplee, L. Raplee, T. E. Reed, W. G. Riley, K. C. Rupert, A. D. Sanial, W. J. Schnurbusch, S. S. Schworm, L. F. Scott, R. E. Seaton, J. C. Smith, J. H. Smith, G. M. Sullivan, W. J. Summerville, W. W. Talbott, V. B. Tallman, F. J. Thomas, E. H. Thompson, E. E. Unger, H. F. Wahlgren, J. F. Warren, R. C. West, G. C. Westervelt, A. E. White, C. E. Wilson, H. H. Wright, F. D. Young. Total (103), \$92,700.

Local forecasters (\$1,000): H. C. Bate, W. T. Blythe. Total (2), \$2,000.

Local forecaster (\$900): S. S. Bassler. Total (1), \$900.

Assistant observer (\$840): G. E. Matthew. Total (1), \$840.

Observer (\$600): E. S. Wiest. Total (1), \$600.

Student assistants (\$300): J. M. Hazen, W. M. Kenealy, F. H. Miner, J. Pennywitt, R. M. Rightsell. Total (5), \$1,500.

Expert in vessel reporting (\$840): L. Rogers. Total (1), \$840.

Unskilled laborer (\$300): Bryan Byrd. Total (1), \$300.

Congress has never had anything to do with fixing these salaries at all, except as to the maximum amount that can be paid, and here are these men, some receiving \$3,500 a year and some of them \$200 a year. Who fixes the amount that shall be paid? The Chief of the Weather Bureau. It was through this system, Mr. Chairman, that the late unfortunate Chief of the Weather Bureau, Willis L. Moore, wrecked himself, because by virtue of the power in the lump-sum appropriation he organized a system of men within the Weather Bureau to fight his campaign to be appointed Secretary of Agriculture, and he fell. I do not think this Congress ought ever to place in the hands of any man such a great power which might be abused and bring scandal and disgrace upon any great bureau of the Government. There ought to be some kind of fixedness and certainty which will limit those who have charge of work in the expenditure of money.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the gentleman has said, but I desire to ask him if he has ever introduced a bill proposing to repeal the law that fixes this lump-sum appropriation, and whether he has followed that bill to the proper committee and asked that committee to report it?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have not; but I have stood on the floor of this House, even when I was in my swaddling clothes as a Member, and I have interposed objections for the purpose of getting regularity, a system whereby political graft could not show its miserable visage anywhere. Mr. Chairman, not only do we have a vast sum of money, aggregating more than half a million dollars, at the disposal of one man for the purpose of employing professional help in the Weather Bureau, but we find that a portion of this money is being used for the purpose of educating other men's children. That may be right. I may not have enough knowledge of the situation to fathom the deep and wonderful recesses of education, but I do have some well-defined ideas about that. I believe that the best education that any man ever received is that which is prosecuted by his own will and his own determination and paid for from his own earnings. However, I am not against furnishing young men bountifully in procuring an education. Here is a young man over here at Pittsburgh, named Pennywitt, who is being educated at Cornell University out of this lump sum, and here are four more—

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What is before the House?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. The gentleman can not stop a gentleman by a parliamentary inquiry. He must make some point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true, the Chair thinks, without doubt.



Mr. FOWLER. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.  
Mr. ANDERSON. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois is not discussing the question under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order. The point of order is well taken, and the gentleman will please confine his remarks to the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg the pardon of the Chair, because I thought I was giving reasons why I should impose this point of order which I think ought to be known to this House, but if the Chair rules it is not proper then I will conform to the ruling of the Chair most gracefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not want to indicate what line of argument the gentleman shall pursue, but only requests him to confine himself in his argument to the point of order since that question has been raised.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman make the point of order against the language—

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, unless there can be some agreement somewhere about this lump sum which has been the cause of so much scandal in the Weather Bureau I will have to make the point of order against the whole paragraph. I do, Mr. Chairman, make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order is well taken and offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 6, by inserting after line 14 the following:  
"For necessary expenses outside of the city of Washington incident to collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and for investigations in meteorology, climatology, evaporation, and aerology, \$1,189,000, including not to exceed \$591,000 for salaries, \$120,000 for special observations and reports, \$275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning, and \$30,000 for traveling expenses."

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment. I think the amendment is subject to a point of order because it carries with it, as I understand, some new material which has not heretofore been in the law. Is that true?

Mr. LEVER. That is not true if I know myself.

Mr. FOWLER. Has it carried "evaporation" heretofore?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, I do not care for it at all.

Mr. LEVER. The bill last year provided for investigations in climatology and evaporation, including the erection of temporary buildings, and so forth. I will say to my friend that I looked the matter over as carefully as I looked over anything in my life, and this is nothing but a continuation of these very items in the present law, with the exception of the word "seismology."

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I renew the reservation for the purpose of obtaining some information. I should like to inquire whether under the phraseology, "for special observations and reports," included in the pending paragraph the Weather Bureau would be authorized to make seismological investigations and observations?

Mr. LEVER. No; the Comptroller of the Currency has held during the last year, 1913, that under this language, which is a repetition of the old language, the Weather Bureau would have no right to make seismological investigations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not recall anything in the language of last year's act which contained the phrase, "for special observations and reports." If there is no limitation on that phraseology, it is certainly vesting in the executive head of this bureau a very wide discretion. He could branch off and go into any line of activity he sees fit, providing it is observations.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to call my friend's attention to this, that in the old act there were a number of observations provided for in these words, "and other observations, warnings, and reports, and for the pay of special observers," and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that found?

Mr. LEVER. In the old language.

Mr. STAFFORD. What paragraph?

Mr. LEVER. I do not have the old bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have last year's act before me, and I have glanced over it and I do not find the phraseology that the gentleman is now reading.

Mr. LEVER. It is on page 3, about the seventh paragraph from the top, where it says:

For observers, for rivers, rain, snow, ice, crops, evaporation, aerial, storm, hurricane, and other observations, warnings, and reports, and for pay of special observers and display men.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is a good enough lawyer to know—

Mr. LEVER. I will say the gentleman is not a lawyer.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). To know that the Comptroller of the Currency in construing that phraseology in last year's act would hold observations to be of such a kindred character to the generally stated purposes mentioned in the paragraph.

In the provision now before the House there is no limitation whatsoever. You provide for "special observations and reports, \$120,000." I respectfully contend that if there be no limitation whatever the head of the Weather Bureau can branch out in all kinds of observations.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend that I am not a lawyer, but I took a short course over here at Georgetown. However, I am lawyer enough to believe that no man construing this act would construe this language for special observations and reports to give him authority to go beyond the general scope provided for in the language creating the Weather Bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. But you are giving special authorizations for observations and providing \$120,000 for that purpose without any limitation whatsoever. It only goes to emphasize that your so-called revised plan does not contain much segregation. In fact, it is going back to the old general omnibus authorization without any restrictions or qualifications.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. MANN. Is not that provision limited by the first appropriation that comes under the head of "General expenses, Weather Bureau," the first paragraph? It starts in "as follows," and then follows the appropriation. It provides for doing certain things that are enumerated, and then the appropriation follows. The appropriation is all limited to the scope of that work as enumerated.

Mr. LEVER. As fixed by the fundamental law regulating the bureau.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not fixed by the fundamental law, but as fixed by the enumeration of those purposes indicated in the preceding paragraph. Of course, if it would bear that construction, I would have no objection to the phraseology. I have no objection, I will say to my friend across the aisle, to the Weather Bureau even making investigations in this seismology field.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will notice that, beginning with the paragraph beginning with "the Weather Bureau," it provides for carrying into effect, and so forth, and for doing certain things, the first paragraph carrying no appropriations, and ending up "as follows." Then comes the appropriation, all of which comes under the first paragraph, so far as the scope of authority is concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that explanation, Mr. Chairman, it being quite certain it would be limited to the purposes as carried in the preceding general statement, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph carries \$275,000 for telegraphing and telephoning. The bill at the session of the Sixty-second Congress carried \$306,000 for the same purpose.

Mr. Chairman, this affects the farmers of the country directly. Living far away from centers, in order that they may have a knowledge of the conditions of the weather, so that they may more scientifically govern themselves in the harvesting and management of their crops—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain that to the gentleman in a moment if he desires an explanation.

Mr. FOWLER. In a moment. I am exceedingly anxious, Mr. Chairman, that that work shall be carried on to the very fullest extent, because I do not think there is another department, if I should use that term here—I use it in a limited sense—in the entire Weather Bureau that brings to the country as great a service as the knowledge of the conditions of the weather when brought to the farms.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman's position, and if he will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. In a moment, Mr. Chairman. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to extend this service further than it has already been extended. I know that an immense saving can be had to the farmer by virtue of supplying him with the necessary information regarding conditions of the weather. I think this appropriation ought to be increased. My section of the State is agricultural, and there we depend upon the warnings from Evansville and St. Louis, and if we can not get the proper appropriations for this purpose we are left to guess at the weather, as the old farmer used to do.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman for a moment.

Mr. LEVER. I wanted to make a statement, but I will make it in my own time.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have in mind that this appropriation ought to be increased to what it was a year ago, at

least, so that the farmers of the country can get the full benefit of the conditions of the weather. This bureau in that department was inaugurated many years ago by a very scientific man, who has spent many years in that bureau and given the best part of his life to it. It ought to be kept up. It ought to be extended, and we ought to have weekly and daily crop reports sent throughout the farming districts of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point by inserting certain information regarding the Weather Bureau, dealing with the question of a lump-sum appropriation and the uses made thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees, when necessary, \$26,000.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, on page 7, insert the following proviso:

"Provided, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved by the gentleman from South Carolina. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the purpose of that amendment is plain; but the fact is, for a good many years the disposition of the heads of departments has been in the direction of segregating the printing business of the Government. In the very recent past—in the last two to four years—the intention of the Congress has been in the other direction. We have a very elaborate Printing Office in Washington, maintained at enormous cost; we have all the facilities there necessary to do all the Government printing. We have the machinery; we have the material; we have light, heat, and organization, and it is under the immediate direction and supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. In just a moment, please. The purpose of that amendment is this: A new printing bill is about to come forth, and in that bill provision will be made for taking care of this printing for the department heads at the Government Printing Office, so far as possible.

The adoption of this amendment will give the Joint Committee on Printing, if the new bill becomes a law, the right to pass on questions of a bureau to print what it please for its department. The difficulty about that, Mr. Chairman, is that we have a separate printing office in each one of the departments, and, segregated as they are, they cost a good deal more money than if they were consolidated; and the reason for that is there is a waste of material, there is light and fuel and heat to be paid for, and many other items of expense in a great many printing offices that can be avoided if we had them all under one department.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman—and I hope the committee will see it in the same light—the amendment will in no way interfere with the good intentions of the bill, but I think the tendency is to turn back from the concentration policy and give the Weather Bureau a little more money than it has had in recent years. But I am not objecting to that. I think they give good reasons for it. But I do believe that the adoption of this amendment will enable us to provide in line with the present purpose of the Joint Committee on Printing, to curtail the printing expenses of the Government as much as possible, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Government Printing Office is to do the work that is done in the Weather Bureau? Have they the rapid rotary presses that are needed?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; they have all the necessary machinery to do this printing, and yet the Government Printing Office is not insisting on doing any printing—and neither will the new

printing bill require the Government Printing Office to do any printing—that can be done more expeditiously and economically in any of the departments than it can be done under the supervision of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman understands this has reference to the printing of maps under the immediate supervision of the Weather Bureau, and that it can be done at less expense and better advantage in the bureau?

Mr. BARNHART. I know that is the contention of the bureau, Mr. Chairman, but I am not conceding that; neither am I prepared to dispute it. I have not the necessary information at hand to do that. But I do say that the adoption of the amendment will in no way interfere with the privilege of the bureau to do all the printing that is necessary for it to do, and yet it will reserve the right to the Joint Committee on Printing to decide between the Weather Bureau and the Government Printing Office as to what printing can be done to best advantage by either.

Mr. HAUGEN. If it can be done just as well in the Government Printing Office, I think it should be done there. However, if it can be done better in the bureau, I would prefer that it should be done there. I think the amendment is so worded that it works no hardship on the bureau?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it does not work any hardship on the bureau.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The language of the amendment will not interfere with the necessary printing that is now being done or will be done hereafter in the bureau itself. It simply provides for such printing in the Government Printing Office as need not be done with special expedition?

Mr. BARNHART. That is all.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and accept the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], unless there is some objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the erection of a building at Neah Bay, Wash., to be constructed under the supervision of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, and for all necessary labor, materials, and expenses connected with this work, \$3,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves the right to object on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman whether it is customary for these new stations to be constructed out of general funds, at the discretion of the Chief of the Weather Bureau? Can the Secretary of Agriculture, without specifying the particular appropriation, build a station at a particular place?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Illinois that my recollection is that heretofore these appropriation bills from the Committee on Agriculture have carried authority for the construction of buildings of this kind. I recall that in the city of Columbia, in the district I have the honor to represent, the Weather Bureau did erect out of the general fund a building of this character. That was six or eight years ago.

But I see no objection to this. On the contrary, I think it would be well for the Department of Agriculture to let the House know, through the Committee on Agriculture, just when it does want to erect a building.

Mr. MANN. I take it, without knowing what district in Wisconsin this is—

Mr. STAFFORD. It is in the State of Washington, I can assure the gentleman, not in Wisconsin.

Mr. LEVER. It is really to rebuild the present station there. The recommendation before the committee is that the man who is in charge of the station at Neah Bay, Wash., is in charge of one of the termini of the cablegraph, and he has been living in a little shed there for a good many years, and his place has become absolutely uninhabitable, and they ask this to build decent quarters in which he can live.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to be erected. Is there not some appropriation from which they can erect it themselves, if they think proper? In other words, I do not think it is good policy for Congress to start in and indicate certain stations. I remember a few years ago the distinguished Committee on Agriculture either recommended particular stations or brought in an appropriation in which they indicated where the stations were to be erected, and at that time all the stations that were to be erected were to be erected in districts represented by the



distinguished members of the Committee on Agriculture—which was very natural, because they knew better about the conditions in their own districts than they knew about the conditions in other districts. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Nobody on the committee represented that section, I will say to the gentleman, so that this is a patriotic investment to be made in the State of Washington.

Mr. MANN. I am speaking of the general principles.

Mr. LEVER. In the present law we carry general authority for the construction of buildings outside of the District of Columbia by the Weather Bureau, under the direction of the Chief of the Weather Bureau.

That is in the present law; but I take it in naming this station here the department desired to call attention to the fact that it was one of their special stations out in that wild, bleak country.

Mr. MANN. This is a station already located?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is a station already located, and this is really for the repair of a building.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand it correctly, there is a general fund out of which buildings can be erected at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I think there is no fund in this bill out of which he could do so; but, as I said to the gentleman from Illinois, I remember that about six or eight years ago the Secretary of Agriculture did erect, in my own district, in the city of Columbia, S. C., a building which cost \$12,000; but I was not quite so well informed then as I am now, I hope, on the proposition. If the Secretary has any fund now out of which he can erect a building I do not know it. It has not been called to our attention.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I think the building to which the gentleman refers was erected out of a lump fund which was carried in the bill for that year, but there is no lump fund of that kind in this bill.

Mr. GARNER. I want to get exact information, if I can, from the committee, whether or not there is carried in this bill any appropriation out of which the Secretary of Agriculture can erect buildings in which the keepers of Weather Bureau stations throughout the country may live?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to my friend from Texas very frankly that it is my belief that there is not a single dollar in this bill that can be used for that purpose, except as carried in this particular item to which we have called attention.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman realize the difficulty of a Member of Congress who has weather stations in his district, when a provision of this kind is carried in this bill, and in the future he may not be able, possibly, to get a similar appropriation for the housing of a man and his family in the district which he represents? Does not the gentleman realize that some good reason will have to be given for that?

Mr. LEVER. I will say, in answer to that, that the department is not going to locate observation stations in anyone's district unless it provides the funds with which to house the man who has charge of the station and his family, if he has one, and the instruments with which the observations are made.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman mean to say that in each one of these two hundred and odd stations that he speaks of there is a house provided by the Government to take care of the man in charge of the station—

Mr. LEVER. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. GARNER. Wait a moment. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is a house built?

Mr. LEVER. Either built or rented.

Mr. GARNER. There is a good deal of difference between a house built by the Government and one rented by the Government; and what I am trying to call the attention of the gentleman to is that by virtue of the carrying in this bill of the provision for this station, there will be a discrepancy between this station and others where they must rent houses, and there will be a continuous effort made by Members of Congress, doubtless, in response to requests from the men who are taking care of weather stations, to have the Government make a direct appropriation for the building of a house at each station to take care of the family of the weather observer.

Mr. LEVER. I think if my friend will take into consideration the fact that this is an existing station, and that it is far out on the coast of Washington, at an uninhabited place, he can very readily distinguish that case from the average Weather Bureau station.

Mr. GARNER. That makes a very different proposition, when the gentleman states that there is no house there to be

rented for the occupancy of the gentleman in charge of that station.

Mr. LEVER. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the language of the hearing:

Mr. CALVERT. Neah Bay is the terminus of one of the Weather Bureau's telegraph lines, a point from which observations must be obtained. It is in a wild, uninhabited section of the country. For a number of years this operator has been occupying a building which was formerly a storehouse for an Indian post. It was repaired and put in some sort of order. It has got to a point now where it is unfit for human habitation, and we propose to put up a small habitable house to replace that structure. We must have a house there, because it is a telegraph terminal line and there are no houses in that section that can be rented.

Mr. GARNER. I am in perfect accord with the gentleman that he ought to carry this provision in this bill. What I am calling attention to is that if we once establish the policy of building a house at each one of these two hundred and odd stations throughout the United States, we must do it by wholesale, and not at retail, as indicated here. The explanation given by the gentleman that it is not possible to rent a building at this station, presents an entirely different case; but I believe that, as a general proposition, it is more economical for the Government to rent houses at the various stations throughout the United States rather than to build them. The Government is building \$50,000 post offices where it can rent a building suitable for a post office for \$10 a month. That is the reason I have undertaken to call this matter to the attention of the committee at this time.

Mr. HAUGEN. I wish to state that the Government owns but a few of the buildings; that the bureau has not constructed the buildings except where Congress authorized it. I wish also to state that a good deal of pressure has been brought to bear on the committee to authorize appropriations, but the committee has been going very slowly in that direction. I believe the last committee reported in favor of constructing four buildings, but it went out on a point of order.

Mr. GARNER. At this point it occurs to me, and I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina and the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking Member on the Republican side, would agree with me that if we undertook to establish the policy of building these houses to take care of the keepers of the weather stations they would need to go into this matter very thoroughly. If it is more economical, it ought to be done, but if it is not, I do not believe we ought to start by piecemeal, because of some pressure that is brought to bear on the committee to build some particular station.

Mr. HAUGEN. The committee has never authorized the building of any except where a very strong showing was made, and it has been left to the discretion of the Secretary.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This is an emergency; it is isolated, and there is nothing like it in any other section of the country.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman that this ought to be constructed, but in regard to leaving it to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, as mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa, it is like leaving the establishments of stations throughout the country to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The stations would be likely to be established where the strongest pressure is brought to bear. If a lump sum were appropriated for that purpose, the buildings would be built where the most pressure was brought to bear on the Secretary. I do not want to subject the Secretary of Agriculture to this tremendous pressure.

Mr. HAUGEN. We have no lump-sum appropriation in this bill for building these buildings.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas about bringing pressure to bear on the Secretary of Agriculture, in whom I have a great deal of confidence. Undoubtedly pressure is brought to bear on him, but it was discovered long ago that it was easier to work around and through the members of the committee than it was to work through the head of a department.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say that I have as high an admiration for both the outgoing and the present Secretary of Agriculture as any Member in this House.

Mr. MANN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. Apparently there would be no item in the bill out of which this building could be constructed except the \$1,189,000 item for collecting and disseminating meteorological, climatological, and marine information, and so forth. I suppose that is intended to be used elsewhere. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I think it is fair, Mr. Chairman, to say that the Government erects no buildings except where there are certain local conditions that make it absolutely necessary.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Referring to the paragraph on page 6, I think the chairman stated that amount had been increased in order to provide for observations relating to seismology.

Mr. LEVER. No; my statement was that out of the total fund the Weather Bureau thought it could set aside a sufficient amount to begin the work, and that the cost of the seismological work would not be over \$10,000. It would take them a year or more to organize the work.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In view of the fact that the committee has stricken out the word "seismology," would it not be well to provide for that amount of reduction?

Mr. LEVER. No; we do not think so, for the reason that this appropriation does not become available until July, and of course the department would have to reorganize the forces to handle the work.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell and dispose of in whole or in part, or lease in whole or in part, the tract of land consisting of 84.81 acres of land, more or less, known as Mount Weather, and located in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, in the State of Virginia, including all buildings thereon, and the sum accruing from such sale or lease, after deducting the cost of sale or lease, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph. I would like to hear the chairman of the committee state the reason for this item in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in 1903, about 10 years ago, the then Chief of the Weather Bureau bought about 84 acres of land at a point called Mount Weather, out in Virginia, and erected what is known to us on the committee as the Mount Weather station. There was an investigation as to whether or not he had the authority to do that under the law, and my recollection, at least, is that it was held that he did have such authority. We have expended at Mount Weather the sum of \$483,075.15. The work at Mount Weather is largely scientific, the exploration of the upper air by means of balloons and kites, to determine the solar radiation and what effect it has on atmospheric conditions, and the like of that.

Of course, that is purely a scientific proposition, with which I am not so familiar, and perhaps my explanation of it is not very lucid. It has been determined, under the reorganization of the Weather Bureau by its present chief, that this character of work can be done best in the West, in the pathway of the storms. They call attention to the fact that in sending their balloons up, sometimes as high as 20 miles, the drift of the wind frequently carries them out to the Atlantic Ocean and the records are lost, which results in a great deal of valuable information floating somewhere on the waves of the Atlantic Ocean.

They contend, also, that the atmospheric conditions at Mount Weather do not make for the best study of this problem.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Do they send balloons up, as the gentleman said, 20 miles?

Mr. LEVER. I am informed that that is the fact.

Mr. COOPER. More than 100,000 feet?

Mr. LEVER. Yes. They attach a little instrument to the balloon. Of course, the instrument is very sensitive, and it records the varying conditions of the upper air. Attached to the instrument is a notice that if anybody finds it, he will please return it to the Weather Bureau, and from this data they have been collecting there for 10 years they have been able to issue some remarkable scientific information. I presume it would not be fair to say that this half million dollars, in round numbers, had been wasted, because I do not believe that money expended along investigational lines is ever wasted. It may be we will never reach a conclusion from it, but the fact will remain that if we should happen to reach a conclusion that is of any value to civilization and humanity, it will be of so much value as will offset all that we have spent in a negative way in getting to the conclusion.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is there any provision in this bill for a continuance of this work?

Mr. LEVER. There is no provision in this bill for a continuance of this work. As set out by the item, it is the purpose of the Department of Agriculture to establish in connection with the Signal Corps service at Omaha, Nebr., this same character of work, because Omaha happens to be in the path of the storms which sweep across from the west into the Central West and across the continent, and their plan is to have 15 or 20 outlying stations near Omaha for the purpose of developing not only what takes place within the center of the storm region, as the storm

goes by, but what takes place on the outskirts of the storm also, and they inform us they need nothing at all in connection with this work except a few very cheap buildings that will house their instruments, balloons, and kites. Instead of having a great structure and four or five magnificent buildings, as they have at Mount Weather, we shall have only a few little sheds to house the instruments with which to do the work.

Mr. ANDERSON. Where is the authority for the construction of these buildings in Omaha and the vicinity?

Mr. LEVER. There is no authority, and I imagine the buildings will not cost \$25 apiece.

Mr. ANDERSON. But they must have some authority to construct them, no matter what they cost.

Mr. LEVER. There is no definite authority in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. If they could take out \$25 from this lump-sum appropriation, why could they not just as well take out \$25,000?

Mr. LEVER. I may be entirely mistaken about that. The gentleman from Wisconsin, dealing as he does with a large appropriation bill, knows how hard it is to think of everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. But in the preparation of the Post Office appropriation bill we go to extremes in segregating the various items, because it was brought to the attention of the committee 10 years ago, when I first served on that committee, that appropriations under lump sums begot graft and speculation, and it was necessary to restrict the department officials as far as possible in the exercise of wide discretion in unlimited appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. On second thought I am sure that I am mistaken as to any fund here provided from which they can pay for the erection of any buildings, for here is a memorandum furnished me by the Chief of the Weather Bureau in which he says that it is not proposed to erect permanent buildings or establish any extensive plant, but to rent the necessary quarters and provide the simplest possible equipment that will make it possible to send up kites and balloons from this point at the central station. In other words, they are going to rent some buildings, and not build any.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the reason I made the inquiry is because we have apparently blown in \$400,000 in establishing a summer resort at Mount Weather, and there ought to be some limit upon the expenditure of a sum for the same purpose.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman's inquiry was quite pertinent, and I am glad that he called my attention to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the gentleman has the floor I would like to direct one query to him. I take it from his exposition of this weather resort down here on the Potomac, or whatever it is, that the present Secretary of Agriculture or the present officials supervising the Weather Bureau deem it is no longer practicable or expedient to continue its operation.

Mr. LEVER. It is the intention of the service to use Mount Weather Station for a simple observatory station, keeping one man at a salary of about \$1,000 annually.

Mr. STAFFORD. If it is the confirmed opinion of the departmental officials and the conviction of the committee, as I take it, that there is no further use for this resort, then I ask the gentleman why has the gentleman provided in this paragraph an authorization to the department to lease it? Why not dispose of it outright; why should the department engage in a policy of leasing property for which it has no use and for which it will never have any use?

Mr. LEVER. The committee took that very proposition into consideration, and we felt that to direct the Secretary outright to sell this property would mean we would have to sacrifice it outright.

Mr. STAFFORD. In your phraseology the committee left it in the discretion of the Secretary to sell. There is no mandatory direction to sell at a sacrifice price, and it can not be construed he would be obliged to sell at a sacrifice.

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman again I am not a lawyer, but the lawyers who are on the committee thought that a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to sell without this proviso would mean that he would have to sell.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not direct him to sell. Your plain phraseology does not require that.

Mr. LEVER. We are trying to give the Secretary the power to try to get the most he can for the property.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; you are authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the leasing business, to continue holding this property for years under a lease system, if he so elects.

Mr. LEVER. If my friend will let me make a statement for about three minutes, I think I can clear it up in that length of time. We put this proviso in here for the purpose, as I said a moment ago, of giving the Secretary the right to sell or lease



at his discretion, but in the meantime we will spend \$1,000 per annum at the station there. We are providing for only that much. There is a rumor going along, which seems to be pretty well confirmed, that a street railway is to be built from Blue-mont, I believe it is, a terminus of a little railroad out of Washington, out to Mount Weather. If that is true, it may be a year or so before the railroad will be built; certainly that property will be much more valuable than it is now. This place is about 6 miles from a railroad, 1,800 feet up on a mountain. It is a beautiful spot which overlooks the Shenandoah Valley on one side and Loudoun on the other. Nobody will want this property, or at least want to give anything like its true value for it unless they have some means of communication. We think it would be better to give discretion for a year or two, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee to the report of the Secretary of Agriculture upon this proposition. Referring to Mount Weather, he says:

A committee of scientists from the bureau reported against the use of this property for aerial research in 1903, and within the past year other committees reported that solar radiation, upper-air research, and dynamic meteorology could better be carried on at other locations. For this reason the department has determined to discontinue the research work at this observatory and operate it simply for the taking of climatological records. This can be done by the man who will protect the property, at a total cost of about \$1,000 a year. This will make available approximately \$12,600, which can be expended to far greater advantage for scientific research.

Mr. LEVER. That is right.

Mr. ANDERSON. It struck me if this property, which has cost \$490,000, will only bring about \$13,000 rent a year, less than 3 per cent, we had better get rid of it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the Secretary of Agriculture now has no authority on earth to rent the property or to sell it. It is not rented at all, and probably will never be used for the purpose for which it was built; but it is our intention—

Mr. ANDERSON. But the Secretary apparently has no intention whatever of renting it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, the Secretary, I take it, will follow the direction of Congress, and we are directing him here in this bill to rent or sell it, in his discretion.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What does the gentleman from South Carolina think of a proposition to permit an executive officer of the Government to sell 80 acres and more of Government land at any figure that may please him without first reporting the terms of sale to Congress? It may be worth \$500,000. It is customary when public lands are to be sold to have them appraised and the executive officer instructed to sell, but not at a price less than the appraised value.

Mr. LEVER. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the language of this bill, would go through the ordinary procedure in the sale of public property. I take it he would have it advertised for sale and have it appraised, and the proceeds of it, as the gentleman will see, are to be turned into the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous fund. If my friend will offer an amendment that a report shall be made to Congress, I will accept it.

Mr. GARNER. The point of order is still reserved against this paragraph.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit me to say one word?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think that Government real estate should be turned over to any executive officer to be disposed of in his discretion without any appraisal and without a minimum price fixed by law. We all know that the present Secretary of Agriculture is a man of the very highest integrity, but this is a government of laws and not of men; and in disposing of Government lands we ought always to remember that maxim. My judgment is that there ought to be a price fixed by this bill below which he can not sell, and that, in any event, such sale should be subject to confirmation by Congress before title can pass.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will prepare such an amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I will.

Mr. GARNER. I had two objects in reserving a point of order against this proviso—first, to bring out the thought that has already been suggested, that this extravagant expenditure of money was made without the Committee on Agriculture apparently knowing anything about it. And I want to draw the committee's attention to the fact that this bill ought to be guarded in the future so that no Secretary of Agriculture or Chief of the Weather Bureau or any other chief can make an extravagant expenditure of money of this character without Con-

gress knowing something about it. [Applause.] And in this connection I want to call the gentleman's attention to one remark he made a while ago, that possibly the Secretary of Agriculture now had authority under this bill to erect buildings in Omaha or somewhere else, although they might not cost more than \$25. If there is such authority in here I hope the gentleman will point it out to the committee, in order that we may have an opportunity to discuss the matter and see if it should not be stricken out of this bill. Because if you can expend \$25 for the purpose of erecting buildings at Omaha or any other place you can expend \$25,000 or \$250,000 if carried in this bill. Evidently these buildings were erected at these summer resorts without Congress knowing anything about it, or else it would not have been done, and I believe that this committee ought to so guard these appropriations that these palaces and these winter or summer resorts can not be built unless they first come and submit their estimates to the judgment of the Congress.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I will.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The buildings at this Mount Weather station were built out of a lump-sum appropriation. It was not carried in this bill, and probably never will be carried in the bill as long as the present chairman presides over this committee and as long as the membership is as it is now. But from year to year, where the stations were not designated specifically, like the one stated in this bill, a lump-sum appropriation was made, and it left it to the Chief of the Weather Bureau or the Secretary of Agriculture to locate those buildings and erect those buildings, one building at a time, in addition to the building at Mount Weather, until the present plant was erected.

Mr. GARNER. I understand this was a near public scandal. In fact, it is as much subject to criticism as any one act of its size that you can think of within the last 10 years.

Now, may I ask the chairman another question? If I understand the law applying to public lands, the lands used by the Agricultural Department, the War Department, or other departments of the Government, there is absolutely no necessity for this legislation. I understand the law to be that when any public property, occupied or used by any department of the Government, is no longer necessary for the use of the Government, a mere Executive order carries that property into the public domain and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell it under the general laws that now exist on the statute books. If I am in error on that I would like to know it, but if that is the rule there is no necessity for the proposition in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. As I have suggested so many times, I am not a lawyer; but this matter was urged on us by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and I take it, of course, that the proposition had been submitted to the solicitor of the department, who is a very able lawyer, I understand. But even if the gentleman's contention is correct, it would do no harm to leave the provision in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Well, I think some harm could be done. Why is it necessary to have two departments of the Government authorized to sell the public domain?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. In just a moment. For instance, there are a number of military posts in this country that are being abandoned, and constantly Executive orders are being issued carrying them into military reserves.

Mr. MANN. There is a special law on that subject.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that there is a special law on that subject. But what I am trying to ascertain is whether there is a statute authorizing the President of the United States to issue an Executive order carrying into the public domain any public property that is no longer needed for the purposes for which it was formerly used?

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe, so far as my information goes, that the departments are without any authority to dispose of public land, unless there are special statutes authorizing it, as in the case of abandoned Army posts.

But, again, I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he suggests that if this is to go into the national domain, it might be sold for the small figure of \$1.25 an acre, and I do not suppose the gentleman will favor such a reckless policy as that.

Mr. GARNER. No. I suppose the gentleman from Wisconsin will not undertake to try to create the impression that the present able Secretary of the Interior, under the rules governing the sale of the public domain, which permit him to sell it in as large or as small lots as he may desire, would sell it,

even if he desired to, at such a low figure as the gentleman names.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the general law he could do that.

Mr. GARNER. He would not have the right to enter upon that, but the Secretary would have the right to sell it in such quantities as he might see proper, and if he did that, he would do it at public auction.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman is in error as to the law.

Mr. LEVER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the two propositions are entirely different. I do not take it that in the general sense of the use of the words "public domain" this property would be included, but I want to call my friend's attention to this fact: Assuming that there is such a law as that to which he refers, and the President does have authority by Executive order to sell this land, does not the gentleman think that it is a rather unwise policy and is it not a rather unwise thing to ask the President of the United States to issue an order about a proposition concerning which he can not know very much, and is it not far better that these people should act under the authority of law and by the direction of Congress?

Mr. GARNER. I will say to my friend from South Carolina that the President could secure just as much information upon this subject as the committee could regarding this property.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he thinks the President could order the Capitol Building sold?

Mr. GARNER. I hardly think so.

Mr. MANN. Why not, on the gentleman's statement?

Mr. GARNER. I say if it is no longer used he might.

Mr. MANN. Well, the President might determine that it was no longer used.

Mr. GARNER. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he thinks the President has the right to convey back into the public domain any property of the United States that is now used by some department of the country and is no longer necessary for such use?

Mr. MANN. Clearly he does not have that authority. As to military reserves, there is a special law providing that they shall be covered into the public domain and sold in a particular manner, as set forth in the law, and the difficulties surrounding such a transaction are so great that whenever we have one we pass a special law throwing it into the general method of entering the public domain.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that scientific investigation is profitable, even though the results may not be immediate. Gentlemen here without much knowledge of the subject have idly referred to this as "a summer resort" or "a winter resort." I was over in Atlantic City last Sunday, and read in the New York Sun, when it came in the morning, that it was going to be a fair day. I do not know where they got their information. This purported to be a weather report. I was out walking with the gentleman from Wisconsin, and we walked for 6 miles in a bitter, biting snowstorm. Probably that was not the fault of the Weather Bureau.

The truth is no one has yet learned and is able to tell the principles that guide the weather, and yet we know that nothing happens in nature except under law. The weather is guided by law. These people in the Weather Service some years ago attempted to obtain information of the upper currents of air, in the hope that in course of time they might learn more in regard to the principles which govern the movement of air upon the earth's surface. They have not learned a great deal, probably, in the way of principles, although they have learned a great deal in the way of facts. It was a surprise, undoubtedly, to nearly everyone in the House to hear the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] say that they have been sending up balloons for a distance of 20 miles. I say that if any Member of the House who is not acquainted with the facts had been asked if it were possible to send up a balloon 20 miles in the air he would have said it was not possible.

They have learned a great deal concerning air currents. They do not desire to abandon the work, but having experimented here, where they can compare one experiment with another, the department now wants to move the experiments off to some distant point, where comparisons will be of no value. I do not agree with that. It is the tendency of new officers to say that the work of their predecessors was valueless. Why, these men in the Weather Service may be gone to-morrow. They will, at any rate, soon be gone, and the next crop that comes in may think that these experiments ought to be carried on here, where they were before.

While it is immaterial to me whether they keep on with these experiments, I think they ought to keep the ground and the buildings—buildings which have cost a great sum of money and which can not be replaced without a great expense if they should ever be used. Of no value to sell, they can not be sold for any price to speak of. Having been constructed for this particular class of work in the main, they had better keep them, at least for a few years, before they dispose of them. And the chances are that the present officials in the Department of Agriculture in the course of a little longer time will themselves reach the conclusion that when they know so little about predicting the future of the weather, as they proved last Sunday, they will want to get additional information about the upper currents of the air in the hope that they may be able to make their predictions more accurate and for a longer time in the future.

I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. I am trying to find the appropriation from which they have made the expenditure for the conduct of that work. Is it the gentleman's purpose to ask that we continue the work out there; and if so—

Mr. MANN. I think that has been paid out of the lump-sum appropriation, which is here \$1,189,000.

Mr. LEVER. It has been costing \$25,000 a year, approximately, to do that.

Mr. MANN. I should imagine that they will do what the Secretary has indicated was his intention, to maintain some one there to do ordinary work in the way of observation and take care of the property. There is no loss about it.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that is correct.

Mr. HAUGEN. The statement of the Secretary is that it will cost about \$25,000 to maintain these buildings, and then the average cost of maintaining an ordinary office.

Mr. MANN. They say they want somebody to make observations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that the House met at 11 o'clock this morning, and we can not go very far with the Bureau of Animal Industry to-night.

Mr. GARNER. Let us read down through page 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for the Weather Bureau, \$1,668,270.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. In reply to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said with reference to the weather in Atlantic City on Sunday, I think he was misled by the weather forecasts published in the New York Sun. I believe the officials of the Weather Bureau claim that the bureau foretold the coming of this blizzard or storm, and thereby saved the shipping of the country something like \$10,000,000.

Mr. MANN. Yes; they said that after the storm had passed by.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I do not wish the gentleman to claim that the New York Sun is more reliable than the officials of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. MANN. The Sun got its information from the Weather Bureau.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman undertake to tell the House that the Weather Bureau as now constituted is totally inefficient?

Mr. MANN. I do not.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman undertake to say it is any more inefficient than it was two years ago?

Mr. MANN. I do not.

Mr. GARNER. That is all right.

Mr. MANN. I undertake to say that no one has yet learned enough to forecast the weather accurately on every occasion.

Mr. GARNER. To that statement I think everyone agrees.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the Weather Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,500; 1 editor and compiler, \$2,250; 6 clerks, class 4; 1 clerk, \$1,680; 13 clerks, class 3; 2 clerks, at \$1,500 each; 23 clerks, class 2; 2 clerks, at \$1,380 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,320 each; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 1 clerk, \$1,260; 30 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,100; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 50 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 2 clerks, at \$960 each; 64 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 architect, \$2,000; 1 architect, \$900; 1 illustrator, \$1,400; 1 laboratory helper, \$1,020; 2 laboratory helpers, at \$840 each; 1 laboratory helper, \$720; 1 laboratory helper, \$600; 1 laboratory helper, \$480; 1 instrument maker, \$1,200; 1 carpenter, \$1,100; 2 carpenters, at \$1,000 each; 1 messenger and custodian, \$1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, \$1,000; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 33 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 3 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 9 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$840 each; 10 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$720 each; 2 messengers, skilled laborers, or laborers, at \$600 each; 11 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$600 each; 3 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$540 each; 32 laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 6



laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 watchman, \$720; 1 charwoman, \$600; 1 charwoman, \$540; 11 charwomen, at \$480 each; 4 charwomen, at \$360 each; 1 charwoman, \$300; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$347,030.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13679, the Agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4167. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of other wars than the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4168. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3403. An act to abolish the office of receiver of public moneys at Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2725. An act authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Dwight Mission School on Sallisaw Creek, Okla.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1618. An act granting to the Inter-City Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, acquire, maintain, and operate a railway bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2226. An act for the relief of Joel J. Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, for 10 days, on account of important business.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think that at this stage of the session it is necessary to have the House meet every morning at 11 o'clock and interfere with all the committee meetings of the House?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Committee on Agriculture has a number of very pressing matters that it desires to take up for consideration.

Mr. MANN. How will that committee be able to do it when the next committee that has charge of an appropriation bill will want us to meet at 11 o'clock in the morning, and the point of no quorum is raised, and the Committee on Agriculture are called over to the House in the midst of their committee meeting?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Illinois has been here long enough to know how that can be done.

Mr. MANN. I know it can not. When the House meets at 11 o'clock there is not much chance for committees to work. A few committees like the Committee on Agriculture have the authority to sit during the sessions of the House, but a point of no quorum is often made, and if no one is here it ought to be made.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object? I would like very much to go along to-morrow because of the reasons I have stated.

Mr. MANN. To-morrow is Saturday; what time will the gentleman agree to adjourn if we come in at 11 o'clock?

Mr. LEVER. Not later than this time.

Mr. MANN. That is no concession.

Mr. LEVER. I will concede half an hour, then.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman say half past 4? I think we had better meet at the regular hour and thus give the committees a chance.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

#### PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file views against the bill with reference to exempting vessels in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that four legislative days be allowed the minority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to file their views on the bill repealing free tolls of the Panama Canal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 7, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1922) to repeal that part of the act entitled, "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912, which exempts vessels engaged in the coastwise trade from tolls at the Panama Canal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 343), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11246) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 344), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DECKER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13771) extending the provisions of the act of March 3, 1913, authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River, near Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 345), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14181) granting a pension to Jennie Adel; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14088) granting a pension to Eliza F. Greenwood; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1032) granting a pension to Frank Sanford Stirling; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 14282) to extend the benefits of the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval forces of the United States, their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and the act of February 6, 1907, and the act of May 11, 1912, as amended by the act of March 4, 1913, to the officers and enlisted men who served in the Eighteenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteer Cavalry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14283) for the erection of an addition to the post-office building at Lawrence, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'LEARY: A bill (H. R. 14284) amending paragraph 81 of the act creating a Public Utilities Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14285) providing for the improvement of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14286) to provide for the examination and survey of the river at South Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14287) requiring double postage on certain mail matter forwarded on which sufficient postage is not prepaid; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14288) relating to contracts for the erection or alteration of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREGG: Resolution (H. Res. 434) referring certain claims to the Court of Claims for finding of facts and conclusions of law under section 151 of the act of March 3, 1911, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary"; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring the establishment and maintenance of vocational training schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the New York State Legislature, relative to immigration of insane aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 14289) granting a pension to Mattie Slater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 14290) granting an increase of pension to Alice M. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14291) granting a pension to John Iverson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 14292) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Bucey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 14293) granting an increase of pension to George Cleckner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 14294) granting a pension to Mary A. Ruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 14295) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Munson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 14296) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 14297) granting pensions to Agnes Mann and Mary Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 14298) for the relief of Katie O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 14299) granting an increase of pension to Mary I. Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OGLESBY: A bill (H. R. 14300) to pay the several sums of money found due certain navy-yard employees by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'HAIR: A bill (H. R. 14301) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Fishback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 14302) to reimburse Saunders Lewis, jr., for expenses of the office of clerk of the circuit court of appeals for the third circuit; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 14303) for the relief of the estate of John V. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 14304) granting an increase of pension to Melville Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 14305) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14306) for the relief of C. W. Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14307) granting a pension to Winnie May Barlow, Annie Alice Barlow, and Niles Brunette Barlow; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) granting a pension to Serena C. Dodd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 14309) for the relief of Thomas J. Craycroft; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14310) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Van Fleet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 14311) granting a pension to Henrietta Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14312) granting an increase of pension to Joshua M. George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14313) granting a pension to Edward L. Herriman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to R. Roy Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 14315) granting an increase of pension to William H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14316) granting an increase of pension to William Muer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 14317) granting a pension to Catherine Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 14318) for the relief of Patrick J. Purcell; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: Petitions of various members of the Christian Endeavor of the United Brethren Church, the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, and the United Brethren Sunday School, all of Decatur, Ind., and the Adams County (Ind.) Civic League and sundry citizens of the State, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Albert Sidney Johnston Chapter, Ohio Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy, relative to naming of forts along the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of various Methodist and Episcopal clergymen of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition signed by members of Local No. 911, Farmers' Union, of Sabetha, Kans., in favor of House bill 10076, to prevent stock-exchange gambling in farm products, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mrs. George E. Blakely and 14 other ladies, of Doylestown, Ohio, in favor of the Sheppard-Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petitions of sundry citizens of Monrovia, Cal., protesting against the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Camden Mannerchor and sundry citizens of Camden, citizens of Swedesboro, Woodbury German Society, and sundry citizens of Woodbury, all of the State of New Jersey, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Oxford, Wis., against Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of 383 members of the Baptist Sunday School of Phoenixville, Pa., and the Concord Quarterly Meeting of Friends, at Media, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the National Bank of Coatesville, Pa., and of the Farmers and Mechanics' Trust Co., of West Chester, Pa., favoring change in income-tax law relative to collection at source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, relative to protection of white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Boston Stove and Rail Division of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against passage of House bill 13305, referring to stipulated price of certain merchandise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of 100 citizens of Stockton, Cal., and of 20 citizens of Oakley, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 17 union-labor organizations of California, favoring the seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of Unity Post, No. 171, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, opposing the proposed monthly payment of pensions by coupons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Cooks and Waiters' Union, No. 561, of Sacramento, Cal., opposing House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



Also, petition of Moving Picture Operators' Union of Sacramento, Cal., opposing House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of Mrs. James Bennett, of Kentucky, relative to protection for white and colored male and female citizens of the United States in their constitutional right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of the Fred N. Rix Camp, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for widows and orphans' pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of William E. Hearn and other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of sundry citizens of La Crosse County, Wis., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Pastors' Union and pastors and ministers of the Protestant churches of La Crosse, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the Commodore Barry Branch, No. 331, Continental League of America, against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York State, favoring remedial legislation in the form of pension bills now before Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Swedish Hundred Men's Society, of New York, favoring a bill for the erection of a memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Cook County, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Anthony Wayne Branch, American Continental League, against repeal of exemption clause in Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the First United Presbyterian Church of Brockton, Mass., against section 6 of House bill 12928, relative to changing compensatory time clause for Sunday work by postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of the Burnett immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against passage of the Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., suggesting the last Monday in October be set apart as national Thanksgiving Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petitions of 46 citizens of Madelia, Minn., protesting against national prohibition, and 88 citizens of Worthington, Minn., protesting against Columbus Day as a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Affidavits to accompany House bill 10168, relative to a claim of Leon Greenbaum, of New York City; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against barring The Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Stanwood, Wash., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of various officers of the Bartenders' Local No. 454, of the third congressional district of the State of Washington, and of sundry citizens of the third congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of John A. Beekcoll, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the St. Louis Waiters' Union, Local No. 20, favoring the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of A. D. Porter, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against increasing the postage on magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Washington Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of various voters of the State of Iowa, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of E. Determann; Harry Loewenthal; A. C. Blinn; Samuel L. Orr; Edward Miller, Jr.; William Hinspeter; Boswell Torian; J. L. Knauss; Harvey O. Herndon; and R. A. Brennan, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petitions of citizens of St. Cloud, Elk River, and Akeley, all in the State of Minnesota, protesting against joint resolutions 168, 88, and 50 relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut (Inc.), protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3631, providing for the appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut (Inc.), protesting against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal bill exempting coastwise commerce from tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, opposing any change in the Sunday closing law as regards post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the local branch of the Civil Service Employees of South Norwalk, Conn., favoring passage of the Hamill bill relative to pensions for civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Connecticut State Association of Post Office Clerks, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill relative to pensions for civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn., urging legislation relative to cotton futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Manila Merchants' Association, of Manila, P. I., favoring the legislation for including the Philippines in the 2-cent postal convention between the United States and Great Britain; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of various voters of the State of Illinois, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of various voters of the first congressional district of Nebraska, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Chicago Association of Commerce, favoring bureau for bill drafting and reference; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, favoring House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tennessee, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petition of J. F. Behrend, of San Francisco, Cal., and 31 other citizens and voters of the city of San Francisco, Cal., against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 50 and 88, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of E. Dillstrom, Peter Kiefer, and Louis H. Rovey, citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles Maunhardt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House bill 11898, known as the "Mothers' pension bill"; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring New York City for Army-Navy football game; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, of New York City, favoring the passage of House bill 13044, for pensions for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the General Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 21, United Spanish War Veterans, of Brooklyn, favoring passage of House bill 7374, for pensions for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Michael James Burke, member of the New York Mailers' Union, No. 6, favoring the Bartlett-Bacon bill to exempt labor unions from the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of the Kathryn Fellows Auxillary, No. 28, Department of New York, Auxillary to the United Spanish War Veterans; and the Colonel John Jacob Astor Camp, No. 98, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of New York, favoring House bill 13044, relative to pensions for widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petitions of various voters of the thirty-sixth congressional district of New York, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Cayuga County, favoring prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petitions of the Champlain (Vt.) Aerie, No. 793, Fraternal Order of Eagles, and D. M. Jones, of Williamstown, Vt., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring the passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut, protesting against the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal bill for free tolls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the State Business Men's Association of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of House bill 3631, relative to appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 100 citizens of Kentucky, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the city council of Chicago, favoring passage of House bill 5139, providing for retirement with pension of civil-service employees after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the National Jewelers' Board of Trade, protesting against amending the Sherman Act and favoring amending the national stamping act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William A. Reichert, of Henderson, Ky., relative to increase in appropriation for reclaiming swamp lands, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, favoring passage of House bill 12873, relative to taxation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Memphis Cotton Exchange, relative to certain conditions to be inserted in contracts for futures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of sundry citizens of Michigan, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring investigation of Pere Marquette Railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of eight business firms of Richfield, Idaho, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Memorial of various voters of the fifth congressional district of Wisconsin and Coopers' Union No. 30, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of J. S. Wambach, W. H. Diemert, and other citizens of Moorehead, Minn., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Affidavits to accompany a bill (H. R. 14314) granting a pension to R. Roy Hamby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: Petitions of sundry Jewish citizens of the United States, relative to ritual murder in Kief, Russia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturers and Business Men's Association, favoring changes in the Federal reserve bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Board of Trade of Tampa, Fla., favoring passage of House bill 8199, for flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the American National Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring a rigid examination of the Postal Department of the Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association and the New Bedford Ministerial Union, all of New Bedford, Mass., protesting against any change in law relative to Sunday work for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of Russell French, Herbert A. Terry, Jay Dudley, Charles Geis, A. I. Kappes, F. E. Durant, and 206 other citizens of Zanesville, Ohio, and of Maurice Hartman and 35 other citizens of Duncan Falls, Ohio, against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and churches of Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of M. J. Pfeifer and other citizens of Wyandot and Morrow Counties, Ohio, against House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Berlin Grange, No. 629, of Delaware, Ohio, in favor of House joint resolution 168, relative to national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, March 7, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, our heavenly Father, for the degree of civilization we have attained, especially for the ideal civilization for which we are continually striving; for whatever attainments we have reached as individuals, and for the ideal manhood which is just beyond for which we all long in our better moments; but, above all, for that spirit which is ever leading us toward the higher life in Christ Jesus, illustrated in the life and language of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### HYGIENE OF PAINTERS' TRADE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 389 (H. Rept. 347).

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to have printed 16,000 copies of House Document No. 1477, Sixty-second Congress, third session, entitled "Hygiene of the Painters' Trade."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

### TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, ETC.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I present also the following privileged Senate concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 11 (H. Rept. 346).

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 357, volumes 1 and 2, Sixty-first Congress, and Senate Document No. 1063, Sixty-second Congress, being a compilation of the treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols, and agreements between the United States of America and other powers from 1776 to 1913; and that the superintendent of documents is hereby authorized to order reprinted such copies of the foregoing documents as may be required for sale by his office in accordance with law.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice that this resolution provides for the printing of 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate. That is a document which is very frequently referred to. Of course this is to bring it down to date?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me that while we are printing these 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate it would be entirely appropriate to print copies for the use of the House.